

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

*A Platform for the Free Discussion of
Issues in the Field of Religion and
Their Bearing on Education*

July - August 1958



IN MEMORY

LABOR-MANAGEMENT AND RELIGION
A Symposium

BOOK REVIEWS

Religious Education

Official Publication of the Religious Education Association

Seeks to present, on an adequate, scientific plane, those factors which make for improvement in religious and moral education. The Journal does not defend particular points of view, contributors alone being responsible for opinions expressed in their articles. It gives its authors entire freedom of expression, without any official endorsement. Articles in Religious Education are indexed in the EDUCATION INDEX which is on file in educational institutions and public libraries.

Membership in the Association is \$5.00 or more per year.
Single copies of Religious Education, \$1.00 each.

HERMAN E. WORNOM, General Secretary,
545 West 111th Street,
New York 25, N. Y.

In Memoriam
LEONARD A. STIDLEY, Editor
March, 1948-May, 1958

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

RANDOLPH C. MILLER, Professor of Religious Education, Divinity School of Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

LUTHER H. HARSHBERGER, Chaplain and Co-ordinator of Religious Affairs, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pa.

EDNA BAXTER, Professor of Religious Education, School of Religious Education, Hartford Seminary Foundation, Hartford, Connecticut.

DONALD L. LEONARD, Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., Philadelphia, Pa.

ALVIN J. COOPER, Board of Education, United Church of Canada, Toronto.

ROBERT MICHAELSON, Director, School of Religion, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

CHARLES DONAHUE, Associate Professor of English, Fordham University, New York City.

JOHN SAEGER, Reference Librarian, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

MAURICE FRIEDMAN, Professor of Philosophy, Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, New York.

BENJAMIN SHEVACK, Executive Director, Bureau of Jewish Education, Boston, Mass.

EMANUEL GAMORAN, Commission on Jewish Education, New York City.

GERARD S. SLOYAN, Department of Religious Education, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.
LEO WARD, Professor of Philosophy, Notre Dame University, Notre Dame, Indiana.

The Religious Education Association

Publication and Business Office: 545 West 111th St., New York 25, N. Y.

EDITORIAL AND PUBLICATION OFFICE

409 Prospect St., New Haven 11, Conn.

Published bi-monthly. Printed in the U. S. A.

(Printed at 48 S. Main St., Oberlin, Ohio)

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

545 West 111th Street, New York 25, N. Y.

VOLUME LIII

JULY - AUGUST 1958

NUMBER 4

CONTENTS

		Page
In Memory — Leonard A. Stidley —		
In Memory, Appreciation and Gratitude	<i>Herman E. Wornom</i>	322
He Gave Himself Freely	<i>Walter M. Horton</i>	323
As Administrator	<i>William E. Stevenson</i>	324
As Editor	<i>Randolph Crump Miller</i>	325
As Religious Educator	<i>Laurence C. Little</i>	326
As An Ecumenical Mind and Friend	<i>Emanuel Gamoran</i>	327
As A Man of Charity	<i>Gerald S. Sloyan</i>	328
As Dean and Colleague	<i>The Administration and Faculty of the Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College</i>	329
Labor-Management and Religion — A Symposium		
I. Religion and Its Role in the World of Business	<i>James C. Worthy</i>	331
II. Labor-Management Relations and Religious Education	<i>Victor Obenhaus</i>	340
III. Morality and Administration in Labor-Management Relations	<i>Kermit Eby</i>	346
IV. The Synagogue and Labor Relations	<i>Eugene J. Lipman</i>	351
V. Current Labor Problems	<i>George G. Higgins</i>	356
VI. The Work of Religion and Labor Liaison	<i>Clair M. Cook</i>	364
VII. The Church at Work in the Field of Labor Relations	<i>Charles C. Webber</i>	369
Religion in Current Magazines	<i>compiled by C. R. House, Jr.</i>	339
Interreligious Relationships: Conflict, Competition, and Cooperation with Special Reference to Public Education	<i>George Huntston Williams</i>	381
Christian Education — A Process of Becoming	<i>Gordon E. Jackson</i>	387
Book Reviews		394
Book Notes		399

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

Please notify The Religious Education Association, 545 West 111th Street, New York, New York, of change of address, giving both old and new addresses.

Send notification of change of address at least four weeks in advance.

The United States Post Office does not automatically forward second-class matter.

Entered as second-class material January 23, 1948, at the Post Office at Oberlin, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

IN MEMORY, APPRECIATION AND GRATITUDE

Leonard Albert Stidley was devoted to the work of the Religious Education Association for more than fourteen years. He became a member of its Board of Directors in July 1944, Chairman of its Editorial Committee in July 1946, and Editor of *Religious Education* in March 1948. As editor, Leonard gave freely of his time and talents and without monetary compensation, except expenses, until 1952. With the expansion of the Association's over-all program, beginning in 1950, the work of the editor greatly increased. Leonard was tireless in his efforts to widen the range of ideas covered in *Religious Education* and to secure new authors to write for it. Among the membership of the R. E. A. there are many with great gifts of scholarship and learning. None, however, have given of their talents for so long with such continuing devotion and loyalty as did Leonard.

Leonard Stidley's unexpected death, on May 28, 1958, was a tragic loss not only to his family but to his many friends, to the Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, to the numerous organizations on whose boards and committees he served, and to the Religious Education Association. He believed strongly in the unique function of *Religious Education* as the only journal for the expression of scholarly thought about religious education by leaders of the major faiths in America. There were times when his own energies hardly seemed equal to the task of publishing the Journal, but his decision on such occasions was always that he must carry on. At the time of his death the Journal had reached a new high level in the quality of its articles and in the scope of its thought.

On the following pages two of Leonard's colleagues, two members of the Editorial Committee, and two members of the Board of the R. E. A. express their appreciation for him as a person, as an administrator, as a religious educator, as an editor, as a friend, and as one who always gave a helping hand to any acquaintance who had a problem.

The present issue of *Religious Education* had been planned by Dr. Stidley in February, and authors had been secured for it early in March. Mrs. Stidley gave many hours to helping her husband with the details, including proof reading and make-up, of each issue of the Journal. The readers of *Religious Education* are most grateful to her for this service, and especially so that she has carried on, with the assistance of Professor Harold Fildey of the Oberlin Graduate School of Theology, to see to it that the copy for this issue of the Journal was edited and prepared for publication.

For many years Miss Juanita Schramm of Oberlin served as a part-time secretary to Dr. Stidley in editing the Journal. He once remarked that he could not edit *Religious Education* but for the help of Mrs. Stidley and Miss Schramm. The Association is deeply grateful to both of them. It is also most grateful to Dr. Fildey for his help on this issue.

THE NEW EDITOR

On June 6 the Executive Committee of the Board of Directors of the Association met to make plans for the future editing of *Religious Education*. Dr. Randolph C. Miller, Professor of Religious Education at the Divinity School of Yale University, had been acting editor of *Religious Education* for four issues when Dr. and Mrs. Stidley were on sabbatical leave in England, in 1956-57. Thus he is already familiar with the editorial responsibilities. Moreover, he has wide experience and contacts among religious educators, and has been active in the work of the R. E. A. since 1952. The Executive Committee hopefully turned to Dr. Miller to take over the editorship of *Religious Education*. He will be out of the country for a year, beginning September 1959, but fortunately he was willing to accept the invitation of the Executive Committee to be editor for one year, his responsibilities to begin with the September 1958 issue.

HERMAN E. WORNOM
General Secretary,
Religious Education Association



LEONARD ALBERT STIDLEY
1898 - 1958

HE GAVE HIMSELF FREELY

I am an old friend of Leonard Stidley. My acquaintance with him goes back about 35 years, to the time when he was a student at Union Theological Seminary, and I was a young instructor there. I first learned to know and like him when he enrolled in one of my classes. The succeeding years have made me increasingly proud of my pupil: first as the pastor-director of a great institutional church in New York City, the Church of All Nations; then as my colleague, when he came in 1937 to teach Religious Education; finally as my commanding officer, when he became Dean of our School of Theology about ten years ago.

When you have been associated with a person for so many years, your memory is full of a multitude of impressions — particularly if your friend was such an active and many-sided man as Leonard Stidley. But one impression, I find, out-tops all others as I look back. It connects itself in my mind with a verse in the 6th Chapter of Luke: "Good measure, pressed down, shaken together, running over." That is the way God gives, and the way He asks us to give, so far as human limitations permit. I have never known a man who gave of himself so freely and eagerly, with such a super-abundant, overflowing willingness as Leonard Stidley. I never found out from what deep spring that willingness bubbled up; perhaps some religious educator ought to have questioned him concerning the secret of his motivation, and shared the precious secret with others. He never told, and I never asked. One possible clue to this secret is the fact that he greatly admired his mother's courage and lavish self-giving, as she brought up her family, with conditions that were often difficult.

If you knew him even casually, you must have noticed this willingness to give in Leonard Stidley; but let me cite a few examples to show what I mean. During the early years of his teaching in Oberlin he had a habit of suddenly checking the rapid progress of his car; he would see a friend walking on the sidewalk, and greet him with the cheerful question, "Going somewhere? Can I take you there?" And if you accepted his invitation and stepped into his car, it was more than likely you would find him concerned about something as much beyond the line of duty as that eagerly offered "lift" he had just given you. Very likely it would be some "problem" student he was trying to help. I personally worked with him on two cases of this sort, and I can say that on those two men alone he expended enough time and effort — long interviews, numerous letters, serious thought — to have constituted a full-time job for a man more cautious about husbanding his energies.

The late Calvin Coolidge was once asked how he managed to conserve his health and equanimity while serving as President of the United States. "That's easy," he is said to have replied. "Every now and then I re-read the list of my duties as defined in the U. S. Constitution, and I take care not to do anything not on the list." That was *not* Leonard Stidley's conception of his duties as Dean. You might go into his office with one simple bit of business to present, but you never got out without hearing of a half-a-dozen other matters he had on his mind, and was eager to do something about.

Along with his administrative duties, he continued to carry a considerable amount of teaching, and the heavy responsibility of editing *RELIGIOUS EDUCATION* — a task that he performed with real gusto and real distinction. With a meticulous regard for little details, such as good administrators must have, he still somehow found time for extra services of all kinds. He never married a young couple as a mere matter of ceremony; he always took time to talk with them about their hopes and ideals, and their

plans for the future. During his last illness, he received a long letter from a mother whose son he had so wisely counselled before marriage that she felt deeply grateful, and expressed her gratitude by giving him detailed suggestions about how to conduct oneself during a heart attack — an art which she also had had to learn the hard way. Multiply this a thousandfold, if you want to form an estimate of how much good Leonard Stidley did by taking all his human contacts as extra opportunities for self-giving.

Only God can give Himself away with both hands continually without wearing Himself out. Leonard Stidley was human and mortal, and he did wear himself out. Infirmities began to weigh upon him heavily in the last years of his life. But there was a powerful motor running in him, that would not let him stop, and drove him on through every obstacle. Many of us tried to slow him down, and he did consent to go across the campus at a pace somewhere between a walk and a trot, instead of his customary gallop. He spoke a little less rapidly, and more calmly. But one thing he could not do, without violating his whole character: he could not be stingy with himself. He could not spare himself to the point of giving short measure in any human relationship whatsoever. Whatever he did, had to be "good measure, pressed down, shaken together, running over." Fulfilling the bare requirements of duty — even fulfilling them meticulously — never satisfied him. There had to be something extra, a surplus beyond the requirements, in everything he did. So though his sudden death has shocked us all, there is in it no cause for bitter regret. The one thing he would have regretted bitterly would have been the necessity of living cautiously, stingily, self-savingly, in order to go on living at all. Oh how he would have hated that! God spared him that bitterness, and allowed him to go on living generously, giving himself away eagerly until the last day of his life. He burned his candle at both ends, but it gave a lovely light, and will continue to do so through the years, to all who remember him.

—Remarks by DR. WALTER M. HORTON, *Professor of Systematic Theology, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College*, at the funeral service of Leonard A. Stidley, on May 31, 1958.

AS ADMINISTRATOR

The death of Dean Leonard Stidley on May 28th took from Oberlin College one of its most effective leaders; it deprived me, as President, of a never-failing source of wise and helpful counsel. The Graduate School of Theology and the College as a whole have been strengthened and made more vibrant by his influence.

Leonard Stidley joined the Oberlin family in 1937, as Associate Professor of Religious Education and Practical Theology, after having studied at Carthage College, the University of Illinois, Union Theological Seminary and Columbia University. He became a full professor in 1943, and Dean of the Graduate School of Theology at Oberlin in 1948.

From the time he became Dean until shortly before his death, Leonard Stidley and I customarily met at least once every week during the academic year to confer about matters of mutual concern and responsibility. I always looked forward to our conferences, because no matter how pressing, and sometimes discouraging, pending problems might have been for him or for me, Dean Stidley invariably brought patience, insight, understanding, wisdom and cheerfulness with him. Not only was he determined to carry his own many burdens but he always had time and inclination to share other people's troubles and to leave those people reinvigorated and inspired. To me he exemplified in deed, as well as in word, genuine, effective, buoyant Christianity at its best.

Leonard Stidley's contributions to Oberlin, both college and town, and to the Christian Church, have been very great indeed. His greatest gift was the gift of himself — to his family, to his associates, his church and his community. It was the gift of a dedicated human life, offered simply, without stint or pretension but with exuberant enthusiasm and good will, for the service of his fellows.

Bereavement accompanies his passing, but the joy of his achievement in our behalf will remain here at Oberlin where he so devotedly served. He was the best kind of teacher, one who by his own example inspired young men and young women to take with them not only the knowledge found in books and sermons, but the ability and determination to use knowledge to enrich their own lives and the lives of others.

I join, personally and on behalf of Oberlin College, those who mourn the loss of a good friend and a notable leader in the cause of Christian education.

WILLIAM E. STEVENSON
President, Oberlin College

AS EDITOR

Many readers first became acquainted with Leonard Stidley through the pages of this Journal. He became editor of *RELIGIOUS EDUCATION* in March 1948. He rarely wrote articles and only occasional book reviews. His major interest was in editing a Journal which reflected the many aspects of the work of the *Religious Education Association*, and in doing this job with insight and understanding he earned the trust and friendship of readers of diverse backgrounds. Because the *Association* includes Catholics, Orthodox, Protestants, and Jews, it was important that members of many faiths be served. This Leonard Stidley was able to do without for a moment watering down his own faith.

For the past ten years, *RELIGIOUS EDUCATION* has been an extension of the person of Leonard Stidley, and at the same time he symbolized in his own interests the broad basis of the work of the *Association*. As one peruses the various issues of the Journal, he sees evidence of this in the selection of material and in the choice of writers. As an editor, he invited selected authors to contribute articles on their specialties, but he also had to show editorial judgement in skillful blue-pencil. Furthermore, he had to make decisions concerning many articles submitted for publication, and here again the spirit of the *Association* was evident in his editing.

He wrote book reviews, and they were both sound and critical. In 1948 he reviewed John S. Brubacher's *A History of the Problems of Education*. He knew it would be "a reference for years to come." Often he chose to review books in the field of religious liberty, especially as this problem was reflected in the relation of religion to the public schools. His honest perception is shown in the comment on one such book, that it "evidently is a doctoral dissertation and reveals a pedantry both in form and content." He knew that Murray H. Leiffer's *The Effective City Church* would be "helpful." He hoped, in 1951, that religious educators would do something about *The Workshop Way of Learning*. Jeanette Perkins Brown's *The Storyteller in Religious Education* (1951) he found to be "educationally sound and realistic."

There have been a few other reviews in the past five years. One of the most appreciative is of Mamie Gamoran's *The New Jewish History* (1954), which he found thrilling. Another deals with the 1955 yearbook on *Modern Philosophies and Education*. Of course he liked W. C. Bower's memoirs. The latest review was of a symposium on Christian education written in England.

I cite these reviews because they show some of the interests of a busy editor, administrator, and educator. Only one article appeared during the ten years, and this came to be published because Dr. Stidley joined some others in a series of lectures which became one of the symposia for which the Journal is noted. The article was "Social Processes in Curriculum Building" (September-October, 1952, pp. 313-18).

Although many of us met Leonard Stidley through the Journal, we came to know him as a man as we joined him in the conventions of the *Association* or wherever religious educators are apt to meet. We discovered that behind the editor's blue pencil and rejection slips was a man whom we intuitively liked. Cordial, fair-minded, and dedicated, Leonard Stidley quickly became a trusted friend.

He was in England on a long-delayed sabbatical leave in 1956-57, and it was then that I discovered how much work had gone into the Journal. RELIGIOUS EDUCATION had been a labor of love for Leonard Stidley, and he had been helped on various levels by Mrs. Stidley. It was the kind of service you cannot buy, and for several years the editor received expenses only.

The Oberlin School of Theology has lost its Dean, RELIGIOUS EDUCATION has lost its editor, and we have lost a friend. But the spirit of Leonard Stidley lives with us. In faith, we commit him into the hands of God.

RANDOLPH CRUMP MILLER
*Professor of Religious Education,
Divinity School of Yale University
and Chairman of the Board of
R. E. A.*

AS RELIGIOUS EDUCATOR

In his experience and training, Leonard Stidley combined a number of factors which contributed to successful leadership in his chosen field. From his youth he was active in his local church and church school. He sought the best academic training it was possible for him to receive. He held a number of professional positions, each of which provided opportunity for development of skill and perspective: director of religious education in a local church; member of a denominational research and survey staff; pastor and director of the Church of All Nations and Neighborhood House in New York City; assistant director of field work in Union Theological Seminary; professor of religious education and dean of Oberlin Graduate School of Theology; and editor of *Religious Education*. He held membership in a number of committees and commissions which kept him in touch with responsible leaders in a variety of religious and educational agencies. All his life he was in the *main stream* of religious education.

It was the privilege of the writer to be associated with him in at least two connections: in meetings of the Professors and Research Section of the International Council of Religious Education (now the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of Churches) and in the work of the Religious Education Association. I cannot recall a single meeting of the Professors and Research Section in which Leonard Stidley was not present and active in the discussion and fellowship. He was so well known and so universally respected that, after a period as chairman, it was fairly typical to ask him to serve as chairman of the nominating committee to choose officers for the Section. During the years before 1950 when the Religious Education Association was struggling

along without employed staff, this organization would surely have gone under if he had not rendered such distinguished service as editor of the Journal.

One of Dean Stidley's consuming interests was the improvement of theological education. In his own institution, his administration has been characterized by improvement of physical facilities and raising of scholastic standards. But he found the time to render outstanding service to the American Association of Theological Schools and took a leading part in the establishment of the Association for Schools of Religious Education. In both of these agencies, he used his influence to raise standards and to relate theological studies more effectively to the needs and conditions of modern life. He saw much more clearly than most contemporary leaders in religious education the chasm that exists between theology and many of the other academic disciplines, deplored it, and struggled to find ways of bridging it. He made a distinction between "teaching theology" and "theologizing." On one occasion he wrote:

"A significant religious group is one in which the members 'theologize' — that is, wrestle with nature of God, of man, and of values which bind man and man and man and God together. Theologizing experiences are different from considering problems in theology. . . . Too frequently a curriculum aims to teach theology rather than to provide experiences in 'theology.'" (*Religious Education* 48:317, Sept. 1952)

In spite of a heavy load of administrative work and frequent travel, Dean Stidley never lost interest in teaching. He taught regularly the basic course in religious education at Oberlin, as well as a course in research method. He encouraged his students to make larger use of the methods and results of educational research and assisted them in developing the skills with which to do so. Thus, both in his philosophy and in his practice, he refused to separate teaching and research. These were regarded as two aspects of one total task and responsibility. This insight is sorely needed in religious education generally today.

LAWRENCE C. LITTLE
Director of Courses in Religious Education, University of Pittsburgh

AS AN ECUMENICAL MIND AND FRIEND

Our sages said: "When a righteous man leaves the city there departs from it brightness, glory, and majesty." If this is true, how much more so is that the case when he leaves it for good!

Leonard A. Stidley was not only an educator, he was one of those whose devotion to religious education was unique. As Dean and Professor of Religious Education at the Graduate School of Theology at Oberlin, he brought light and leading to those students who had the good fortune to come under his benign influence. But Leonard was not one of those pedantic scholars who closeted himself in the academy and removed himself from living concerns. He was always close to the practical day-to-day affairs of men. As editor of *RELIGIOUS EDUCATION* magazine he reflected the central ideal of the Religious Education Association to work for the improvement of religious and moral education and provide for free discussion of issues in the field of religion and their bearing on education, integrating them with each other.

No matter to what group one belonged, he could be confident that whatever article he presented to Dr. Stidley for publication was in safe hands. It was quite remarkable that he had no insuperable problems in his editorial work and could easily shift from

discussing a weighty problem in Jewish religious education to similar discussions with a Protestant theologian or to a colloquy about doctrine with a Catholic writer. Each could safely entrust to him whatever he wrote, knowing that it would be treated objectively so as to convey the genuine meaning and even the nuances in what was intended.

In addition to his devotion to his chosen profession, he had a tremendous capacity for friendship. Well do I recall when, in response to a kind invitation to deliver an address on significant values in Judaism at Oberlin, Dr. Stidley invited me to stay over night at his home, and we spent most of the evening exchanging ideas on some fundamental problems reflected in education as well as in religion.

The Religious Education Association was always close to his heart. In this work he made friends with all religious groups and received genuine cooperation from nearly everyone who came in contact with him. There, perhaps, is part of the secret of his success and the explanation of how he was able to carry on his editorial work in addition to his normal duties as Dean of the Graduate School of Theology and as Professor of Religious Education at Oberlin.

Only a couple of weeks before his sudden and untimely illness and passing, we saw him cheerfully participating at a meeting of the Board of Directors of the Religious Education Association. It was difficult to know that day that the Angel of Death was lurking in the background. Our sincere sympathy goes out to the bereaved family.

He will be missed by all religious workers, but especially by the profession of education and religious education.

The memory of the righteous is a blessing!

EMANUEL GAMORAN

*Director of Education, Commission
on Jewish Education, Union of
American Hebrew Congregations,
New York City*

AS A MAN OF CHARITY

The signature was almost a commonplace: ". . . and to Dean Leonard A. Stidley and the faculty of the Oberlin Graduate School of Theology . . . for the kind hospitality accorded me on their campus;" ". . . especially to Dean Leonard Stidley . . . I owe a debt of gratitude for hospitality shown me in Oberlin on the occasion of the delivery of the lectures." The writers in these cases happen to be G. Ernest Wright and Frank Moore Cross, Jr., but testimonials like them could be duplicated dozens of times over. I who write this personal appreciation never experienced Dean Stidley's warmth and jollity on the Oberlin campus. Rather, these qualities radiated themselves toward me in a series of written communications spaced over seven years. We had met no more than three times, in each case away from Ohio. The net effect, however, was to make me think of "29 North Pleasant Street" as a very pleasant place indeed. For there, I knew, lived a person who not only loved his fellow man (theological faculties are replete with people who, by some definition, do that), but who loved me. My most woeful epistolary dereliction or breach of pledged word he never seemed to notice. He suspected the U. S. mails of everything and me of nothing. His gratitude for small services was — there can be no other word for it — touching. His optimism in the face of major set-

backs was impressive. For the latter quality I admired him but for the former ones I loved him.

I think that what marked Dr. Stidley most was his superabundant charity. Possession of that virtue necessarily includes a sense of justice or fairness. I was never able to detect a scrap of bigotry in the man, either "pro" or "contra" anything. He sat down in a Roman hotel one summer night a few years ago after having been to see the Pope and typed out a lengthy postal describing the experience. My first thought was, "I'm glad they got on so well"; and my second: "He didn't have to do that. I'm sure he did it partly to give me pleasure." Dean Stidley's career was filled with actions as generous as that small epitome: the long, hot day of the tourist culminating with a thought, not of self, but of someone three thousand miles away.

The Belgian theologian Emile Mersch remarks in a passage on death that it is, "the capital event of the soul's life." In a sense, he says, every man acquiesces in his own passing by his daily submission to the laws of nature which premise the complete dissolution. "But above all," he writes, "death is an act. . . . By it (acceptance) the will sums up and assimilates the totality of its being, and, at this supreme moment when human character is effaced in the body, stamps that character ineradicably on the soul." (*The Theology of the Mystical Body*, p. 264). Dean Stidley, so very much the servant of God and laborer for the peace of Christ in his earthly life, is now preeminently both in his death. The suffrages of the early Christians for their departed who had not won a martyr's palm used to run: "Eternal rest, light, refreshment, peace." May the Lord in His boundless mercy confer all of these benefits on His servant Leonard, who so loved us; and may He comfort those closest to him, who shared him with us of the Religious Education Association.

GERALD S. SLOYAN

Chairman, Dept. of Religious Education,
Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

AS DEAN AND COLLEAGUE

The Faculty of the Graduate School of Theology, meeting in special session on May 29th, 1958, wish to place on permanent record in the Faculty minutes the following memorandum.

In the passing of Dean Leonard A. Stidley we have lost a wise leader and a true friend of each and all of us. Under his guidance the Graduate School of Theology has made significant progress, and its contribution to the religious life of our times has been increased in many areas.

He had concern for all phases of the work of our School. He promoted a richer common life of both students and faculty. He encouraged high standards of intellectual endeavor in himself and others. He brought about closer ties between the School and the churches. He nourished the interest and support of the alumni. He administered the affairs of the School with tact and wisdom.

Leonard Stidley represented the School with dignity and personal charm. In classroom, the Dean's office, and in the community he gave deeply of himself, expending his energies unselfishly, even to his own personal hurt. His contributions in his chosen field of Christian Education reflected honor on the Graduate School of Theology. He

was in no small degree responsible for the respect in which the Graduate School of Theology is held in theological circles. He worked for high academic standards not only in his own School, but also throughout the membership of the American Association of Theological Schools and the American Association of Schools of Religious Education. His wisdom and foresight helped make possible at Oberlin the Schauffler Division of Christian Education.

Along with the student body, the alumni, and his many friends we mourn his loss. He has joined those of past generations at Oberlin who have built their faith and love into the very structure of Oberlin College. To Mrs. Leonard Stidley, whose love, along with that of Leonard, we have cherished since they first came to Oberlin, we express our deepest sympathy. We pray God's blessing on her and on their son, Leonard, and their daughter, Connie, in the years ahead.

Signed:

WILLIAM E. STEVENSON	J. WILLIAM LEE
GEORGE MICHAELIDES	PAUL SECREST
HERBERT G. MAY	WALTER M. HORTON
THOMAS S. KEPLER	LEWIS L. GILBERT
W. MARLIN BUTTS	WOLFGANG STECHOW
HAROLD W. FILDEY	PAUL H. BOASE
GERTRUDE S. JACOB	EMMA FRANK
LLEWELYN A. OWEN	HAROLD C. PHILLIPS
JOSEPH F. KING	RUTH LISTER
RICHARD C. WOLF	

Labor - Management and Religion

A SYMPOSIUM

The critical need for a re-appraisal of the role of religion in labor-management relations has prompted the editorial committee to present this symposium. We are indebted to the authors who have contributed articles to this symposium, analysing the various facets of this relationship.

We are confident that the readers of this magazine will find these articles informative, stimulating and helpful.

—The Editorial Committee

Religion and Its Role in the World of Business¹

James C. Worthy

Vice President, Sears Roebuck and Co., Chicago

IT IS THE theme of this paper that while modern business enterprise has evolved within a matrix of Judeo-Christian ethics and its values have been profoundly shaped thereby, the fact that these ethical principles are generally expressed in secular rather than religious terms renders them tentative, unstable, and an unsure guide for business policy and personal conduct. This is a serious weakness for which the businessman is only partially responsible; a much greater measure of responsibility must rest with the theologians and the preachers who have failed to make explicit the relevance of religious faith to business practice.

I.

From its very beginnings, American society has been a religious and deeply moral society. In such a society, people judge the actions and policies of business, government, organized labor, and all other institutions in moral terms: whether they are *right*, whether they are *fair*, whether they are *just*. People are highly critical of actions or policies which do not meet these tests. People are not too responsive to

¹A paper given at the Conference, "Religion Faces The Atomic Age," sponsored by the Federated Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago February 2-3, 1958.

This article will appear in the October 1958 issue of the *Journal of Business* of the University of Chicago, and is published here by special permission of the *Journal of Business*.

pleas based solely on rationality or practicality; actions and policies must also serve moral purposes.

American businessmen are part of American society and apply moral standards to their own conduct. And because they too are "American," they show a marked proneness to respond to criticisms based on moral judgments. Businessmen themselves would be the first to agree that their most important business problems are ethical rather than technical.

The ideas of fair play and self-restraint are essentially religious. They help keep dog-eat-dog practices in check and enable the economy to operate without strict governmental supervision and control: self-restraint rather than legal restraint is the rule. The typical emphasis on individual responsibility is another example of an essentially religious idea which permeates American life, including business life.

Even from the earliest days, the founders of American industrial enterprises were likely to be motivated not only by the prospects of material gain but also by a real desire to make goods and services more readily and more widely available to people in all walks of life. The American concept of the mass market is not only an economic concept but an ethical concept as well; to miss its ethical content is to miss

its real significance and the source of its real power.

In traditional American thinking, the profits of business enterprise have been considered not merely a means for personal pleasure and power, but rather as carrying an obligation to use them for public good, either through reinvestment in productive facilities or application to educational or charitable purposes. Here we see clear evidence of the influence of the "Protestant ethic" on American business thinking.

Concern for good employe relations is a distinguishing characteristic of American industrial management. No doubt the actual state of affairs may often leave something to be desired; no doubt there will always be room for criticism and improvement. But at least business leaders explicitly recognize the importance of the subject and spend a great deal of time and money in the effort to promote good relations within the enterprise. In this, business leaders are motivated in part by a desire to improve productivity, minimize industrial conflict, and the like. But this is only part of the story; they are likely to be motivated also by an implicit recognition that good relations between management and men are a positive good in themselves and that human worth and dignity must be protected in the employment relationship as well as in all other relationships within society.

Modern management is also giving increased recognition to its responsibilities to the community and the public — here again, not merely as a means of promoting the good will of potential customers but from a sense of obligation for the welfare of others. The idea of corporate citizenship is growing in acceptance. Business contributes substantially to the support of many worthwhile causes; frequently more important than financial support is the personal leadership for such causes which businessmen provide. Quite clearly, the motivations behind such actions have substantial ethical as well as economic content.

II.

This resume may suggest something of the extent to which ethical norms have

helped shape and direct business practice. It is not difficult to cite instances where such norms have been openly violated, or where they have been observed more in the form than in the substance. In reviewing our industrial history, however, the striking thing is the rapidity with which abuses have been corrected. The worst excesses of the industrial revolution did not persist for long. The gross irresponsibilities of the robber barons were soon curbed, in part by the barons themselves and in part by pressures generated by an aroused citizenry. Especially during the past quarter century has business come to display a marked sense of public responsibility, a sense of stewardship, which is in part a consequence of the development of professional management but more fundamentally a reflection of the pervasive influence of Christian ethics.

We have here, however, a strange anomaly: while Christian — or, if you will, Judeo-Christian — ethics have deeply infused the institutions of our society, including the institution of business, they have done so in a secular rather than a religious guise. This is undoubtedly a consequence of the secularization which has invaded all aspects of our daily life. We recognize moral imperatives, but we are inclined to ascribe to them a social origin and sanction rather than to recognize their religious roots. We bow to the demands of rightness, of fairness, of justice; we affirm the dignity of man and the integrity of the individual; we acknowledge the priority of human values. But we conceive these things in social rather than in sacred terms.

The ethic which guides our lives comes to us through a secular filter. Herein is a source of mortal danger. For while the process lets through the form it screens out the essence. While man's obligations to man come through with relative clarity, man's obligations to God are obscured. Concern for our fellow man comes to be seen as a matter of social convenience rather than a consequence of brotherhood under the fatherhood of God. We come to accept human dignity and individual integrity in others because they are qualities we would

like to see in ourselves, not because they are qualities which inhere in the children of God. We come to see unfairness and injustice as violative of social values rather than as trespasses on the commandments of God. We come to conceive of responsibility as sanctioned by the requirements of living together rather than as accountability to our Heavenly Father.

This is not to deny the good which comes, in the business world and elsewhere, from socially sanctioned behavior; but if we look to and recognize only the social sanctions and forget their divine origin, we cut ourselves loose from our spiritual wellsprings. Our codes of conduct become increasingly arid because they have lost contact with that from which they derived their vitality and strength. These very codes, which are now serving us so well, may become a caricature or worse if they continue to be cut off from their sacred origins. To paraphrase Toynbee, efforts that are beneficent when exerted in the service of religion become demonic when dissociated from religion and an end in themselves.

III.

Something of the dangers inherent in the divorce of business morality from religion can be seen from a consideration of the concept of self-interest as the generally accepted theory of business motivation.

In actual practice, business has shown a broad measure of public responsibility and concern for human welfare. Business practice in this respect, however, is considerably better than business theory, at least as that theory is generally expressed by businessmen when they talk and write about the business system.

According to classical economic doctrine, business was conducted solely for economic gain. Modern economic theory has somewhat softened the bleak picture of the "economic man," but the basic image remains relatively unchanged. The businessman himself generally explains his actions in terms of self-interest. He may also emphasize the idea of service, or of social responsibility, but he is likely to go on to

rationalize service and responsibility as themselves a form of self-interest.

The great weakness of *laissez faire* economics (both the earlier and the later variety) is not so much the reliance on individual freedom and the distrust of governmental controls, but rather the absence — indeed the explicit denial, in official business theory — of any responsibility of the businessman to anyone but himself. Because of the influence of *laissez faire* economics, business has been encouraged to take a very narrow and exclusive view of its role in society. Self-interest remains the businessman's primary explanation of his own motivation and of the central driving force of the business system. Nor does he seek to disguise or hide this conception; on the contrary, he continually calls attention to it. He may seek to soften its harshness by talking about "enlightened" self-interest, but he usually goes on to explain (or quite clearly implies) that he considers enlightened self-interest superior to the narrower variety mainly because the wider sharing of benefits serves to enhance his own or his company's benefit, or helps make the realization of the benefit more certain. Being enlightened is simply being smarter, as he himself is likely to explain at some length.

Self-interest, whether narrow or enlightened, is a very unstable basis on which to erect a system of economic institutions. Institutions must be in harmony with what those who live under them consider to be morally right, and there are deeply ingrained elements of western tradition (as well, perhaps, as of the traditions of most civilizations) which hold selfishness to be one of the cardinal sins.

In terms of Christian ethics, the effort to explain and justify the workings of the business system on the basis of self-interest is to make a virtue out of selfishness and to glorify greed as obedience to higher law. Enlightened self-interest is subject to the same strictures as narrow self-interest. There is always the critical question of *intent*, because intelligent self-interest is still selfishness; morally, it is on a footing with stupid self-interest. Because of the insistence on

a self-interest rationale, the business system is placed, by its own defenders and apologists, in conflict with the ethical foundations of its own society. This conflict is at the root of much of the distrust and skepticism with which the business system is often viewed.

A further grave consequence of the self-interest rationale is that it is a poor basis for establishing and maintaining confidence. In a free society, the question of confidence is fundamental. A democratic system rests on confidence in its leadership, because of the relative absence of coercive means to enforce obedience. Confidence includes confidence that the leaders are acting with the welfare of others in mind. The egoistic concept of leadership responsibility undermines the very foundation on which leadership in a free society rests.

Businessmen are one of the few leadership groups in history whose ethic has been frankly egoistic. The landed gentry of England, the feudal nobility of France, and other ruling castes in ancient and modern times at least protested that their policies were in the interest of the general welfare. They looked to a broader justification for what probably in a great many cases was simple self-interest, but at least they felt constrained to seek such a broader justification. Even the communist party goes to great lengths explaining its policies in terms of their ultimate benefits to mankind.

The avowed motives of the businessman have undeniable virtues. A certain amount of diffidence on the part of business as to the magnanimity of its motives is a good thing. Great and terrible have been the crimes committed against humanity in the name of humanity. The business ethic is not likely to lead to the kind of temptations into which people infected with a zeal for the good of mankind are often led. For all its sins and shortcomings, this is one error of which business is not likely to be guilty. The avowal of self-interest has the further virtue of keeping the public on constant notice of the possibility of abuse of power, which is a very good thing with respect to any power group.

IV.

Nevertheless, the frank and unequivocal espousal of self-interest has serious consequences, for it renders the businessman and the business system forever suspect. While there is wide recognition of the contributions of business to material well-being, there is a marked degree of apprehension in many quarters about business' political, social, and moral values and about its willingness, without external control, to observe the standards of good citizenship or abide by the rules of fair play. Businessmen are respected for their material success and for their ability to handle responsibilities whose nature, while only vaguely understood, are assumed to be very high. But businessmen are distrusted because they are thought to be lacking to some degree in the moral and spiritual attributes considered essential for people in positions of great power.

An American business leader recently lamented "the old type-casting of the businessman as materialistic, selfish, and insatiable in his pursuit of money." But if the public has an image of the businessman as "narrowly and rapaciously selfish, with no responsibility except to themselves and their owners," the businessman himself has largely created this caricature by his own insistence on a theory of motivation based on an outworn theory of *laissez faire* economics.

This image is largely responsible for recurrent demands for more rigid supervision and control of business by government to prevent the abuse of its economic power. Americans are more concerned with the misuse of power than they are with the possession of power. But they are constantly being warned by businessmen themselves that that power is being used for narrowly selfish purposes and inferentially to the possible detriment of others. Under these circumstances, it is wholly natural that people look to government, in which they feel they have a voice and which in theory is concerned for the good of all, to make sure that business lives up to proper standards. Apprehension over business motives also underlies demands for centralized plan-

ning and direction, especially in times of crisis. The resulting augmentation of bureaucratic controls is readily accepted, despite the crippling and impoverishing effects which may very well ensue.

In fact, demands for more rigid governmental controls, public ownership, and the like are best understood in symbolic rather than economic terms. Such demands usually have little to do with technical needs, and in fact may seriously complicate administrative processes; rather, they grow out of a pervading sense of unease that affairs of vital public concern are being conducted without due regard to public interest.

The principle that self-interest is a sufficient guide for personal and public policy (that private vices make for public good) makes the demand for greater public control inevitable because it is simply intolerable that people entrust their welfare to those who, according to their own expressed rationale, explicitly ignore and disregard their welfare except where it happens to coincide, by fortuitous circumstance and on the businessman's own terms, with the welfare of business.

Economic stability often requires strong fiscal and monetary measures, which may be impossible to apply unless their painful consequences can be accepted as necessary for the public good and not merely for the good of "bankers," "Wall Street," and "big business." Likewise, the necessary adjustments which business enterprises must make from time to time (lay-offs during periods of recession, displacement of workers by new machinery, insistence on discipline and productivity at the work-place) must be accepted as part of the system and ultimately for the general good, no matter how painful at the moment. This requires a great deal of confidence indeed on the part of those most immediately affected.

The dangers to business from loss of public confidence are illustrated by the experience of certain Latin American countries (notably Chile) where inflation has run wild, in part because of unsound "welfare" programs and severe restrictions on business enterprise. In Europe, the widespread ap-

peal of socialism reflects an insistent demand that the vital processes of society be in the hands or under the control of government, which in theory at least is concerned for the welfare of all the people. In countries under communist domination, the seizure of power by a militant minority and the subsequent abolition of private business enterprise were facilitated by the broad gulf which had grown up between business and the public.

The attractiveness of communism on ethical grounds for certain persons of unquestionably high moral aspirations reflects their reaction against a business system which expressly states that it subordinates everything to its own self-interest. The strength of the appeal of both socialism and communism is indicated by the amount of socialist unworkability and the amount of communist terror and violation of human rights their supporters are willing to tolerate for the sake of systems which at least give lip service to concern for mankind.

Communists and socialists play up the symbols of human welfare but neglect, and often violate, the reality. The American business system emphasizes the symbols of self-interest, but actually operates with substantial concern for human values. But such is the power of symbols in human affairs that people and systems are often taken at the face value they place on themselves. In this respect, socialism and communism are grossly over-sold and the American business system grossly under-sold — in each case by its own supporters.

The attractiveness of Soviet appeals for underdeveloped countries is greatly enhanced by the distrust of those countries for private business institutions, largely as a result of their suspicion of the business ethic. Ideologically speaking, the free world is at a serious competitive disadvantage in the "struggle for men's minds." Despite Russia's record of unfulfilled promises and her attempts to use economic aid for purposes of subversion, the ethical appeal of Marxism is very strong. Experience suggests that people are much more likely to put up with privation imposed in the name of public

good than with plenty generated as a by-product of self-interest.

In the field of foreign aid, the idea of self-interest has proved a serious handicap. Professions of self-interest have reduced our noblest sentiments to narrow self-seeking, and our most imaginative undertakings to the manipulation of less fortunate peoples for our own purposes. By our own testimony, we are not motivated by concern for their needs but only for our own; their needs are of interest to us only to the extent they happen to correspond with ours. No self-respecting person or people can accept such a relationship, especially where we define it so explicitly and so unambiguously.

As a nation, we are willing to make sacrifices — even great sacrifices. But we cannot explain our willingness even to ourselves because of our commitment to self-interest — for how can self-interest be equated with, say, the supreme sacrifice of being willing to give up life itself? And if we cannot fully understand it ourselves, what about the beneficiaries of the sacrifice — say, the Europeans or the Asiatics for whom so many American lives were forfeit?

But we need not go so far afield, to find examples of the handicaps imposed by the doctrine of self-interest. Organized labor is one of the major power groups in our society. Despite its very great power — power in some cases and at some times very much greater than that of business — organized labor has been subjected to very few controls. This is undoubtedly attributable largely to the fact that organized labor bases its case primarily on concern for the welfare of the working population. Unions are able to take with impunity many kinds of action, including economic coercion, which would be violently condemned if taken by business. They escape effective criticism, however, because they are careful to define such action as incidental to the achievement of the union's expressed aims, the promotion of worker welfare.

Organized labor has so strongly established its rationale in the minds of impor-

tant segments of the public — including those which tend to be critical of business — that labor can afford to be frankly and aggressively selfish in promoting its own interests. Organized labor is one of the few groups in our society that can pursue such a course without arousing widespread public antagonism. In fact, statements by labor leaders that "we're out for all we can get" are as likely to be applauded as not. This attitude on the public's part reflects not only the degree of acceptance of the claim that labor leaders are pursuing the interest of a sizeable constituency, but also a feeling that the businessman deserves whatever he gets, that since the businessman's own ethic is narrowly selfish anyone is welcome to anything he can get away with.

The whole concept of the role of self-interest in business processes needs to be re-worked. The usual formulations of the concept are based on an over-simplification of classical economics. As generally stated, they do not even include the qualifications of elaborations postulated by Adam Smith, much less the realities of modern economic life. The self-interest concept as generally expressed is certainly not a very accurate description of the way things actually work nor the actual pattern of motivation behind most business decisions.

One of the early and most significant of the findings of human relations research was that workers are not motivated solely by economic considerations, that there are many so-called "non-logical" factors (i.e., *noneconomically-logical* factors) which strongly condition their attitudes and behavior. It is curious that this insight has never been extended in any important way to business or management, that while it is now axiomatic that workers are complex and many-sided, management is still seen as the corporate embodiment of economic man. But if the motivations of workers are complex and often "non-logical," the motivations of managers are hardly less so. Managers no less than workers are members of groups that strongly influence their behavior, play roles that are socially defined, are members of a culture with a rich and

elaborate system of values. Managers no more than workers are motivated solely by economic considerations. Not that economic considerations are unimportant in either case, but other factors of great significance are likewise at work. Businessmen, in a word, are "human," too.

Nevertheless, under the accepted canons of business enterprise, businessmen are *supposed* to act only in terms of monetary considerations. Everything they do is expected to pass the test of whether and how much it contributes to profits. The businessman's and the manager's role is very clearly defined in these terms not only by themselves but by society.

Actually, they seldom carry out literally the injunctions of their official creed. As with workers, owners and managers have never acted strictly in the terms of narrow self-interest ascribed to them by economic theory. There has always been a system of *human* relations as well as a system of *economic* relations. The two systems function in terms of two different and sometimes conflicting sets of values, with the result that there is often confusion as to the role the businessman is actually playing at any particular time.

It is amusing to observe the extent to which the businessman will sometimes go in his efforts to explain in terms of self-interest an action which he wants to take for perhaps quite different reasons, some of which may be definitely generous and unselfish. But because generosity and unselfishness are explicitly outside the frame of reference within which the businessman, as a businessman, is supposed to operate, he feels it necessary to explain himself in other terms. One such term is likely to be "enlightened self-interest." One suspects that the frequency with which *enlightened* self-interest is appealed to reflects the difficulty of relating certain acts to self-interest at all, and that the adjective "enlightened" serves merely to suggest a relationship that might be exceedingly difficult to trace out in detail.

In any event, the justification of generous acts in terms of self-interest, whether "en-

lightened" or otherwise, helps soothe the businessman's conscience for acting contrary to his socially defined role — or, perhaps more accurately, helps reconcile the requirements of his role as a businessman and the requirements of his role as a citizen. The businessman's role in society is much more complex than his business role alone, and very often other and conflicting roles take over in what may appear to be strictly business situations. But when this happens, the businessman is likely to find himself very uncomfortable unless he can find a way of explaining his actions as really selfish after all. Under these circumstances, the device of *enlightened* self-interest is a useful one indeed.

This circumlocution also helps make the action more palatable to those who benefit from it. Workers, for example, would be very suspicious if a generous act were presented as anything other than self-interest. They, too, know the behavior appropriate to management's role and are likely to feel uncomfortable — and perhaps resentful — unless the behavior is carefully defined in terms of that role. Their own role as workers, in turn, makes them dislike being indebted to management for favors. Presenting the act as merely selfish behavior on management's part thus gets better acceptance than if it were presented in some other guise. The situation reminds one of a doting father and a loving son who go to great lengths of gruffness to hide their affection for each other and who would be fearfully embarrassed if that affection should ever inadvertently be expressed in words.

Although in actual practice the self-interest principle is considerably muted, whether by "enlightenment," integration of roles, or otherwise, self-interest pure and simple still remains the official and generally-recognized norm of business conduct. This has practical consequences of great significance.

For one thing, it means that in critical situations businessmen are likely to be governed by this norm rather than by, perhaps, their real sentiments or by the norms of their non-business roles. (Who you think you are determines what you do in

the tight places.) Under such circumstances, pressures both internal and external to conform with the expectations of business-role behavior (i.e., straightforward self-interest) are likely to be very great, and the businessman may find himself doing things that in ordinary circumstances he would be most reluctant to do.

Furthermore, in critical situations society is very likely to take business at its word that it acts only in its own self-interest and turn for leadership to others, such as government or unions, whose norms of conduct at least pro forma include concern for the general welfare. This has happened before, as during the last great depression; it could happen again in the course of future crises. What happens during crises, of course, is the critical test of leadership.

We are badly in need of a more adequate frame of reference for business, a more realistic set of norms to guide and inform business conduct, norms which will take much more fully into account the real sentiments of managers and businessmen, which are basically Christian, and the multiple rather than unitary roles they play in actual life. We need a set of norms that will reinforce these Christian sentiments, not neutralize them; a set of norms which will make it appropriate for businessmen, even in the tightest situations, to consider the behavioral requirements of some of their customary roles which, under present definitions, are "non-business" — roles which are tolerated normally but expected to be pushed aside and disregarded in favor of "strictly economic" considerations when the going gets rough.

We need a set of norms which will not serve as a cloak behind which sinful selfishness can hide but a standard which will highlight deviations from the Christian mode of conduct. For egoism in any guise is a form of idolatry, the worship of self. It will no doubt always be present in some degree, perhaps in strong degree, but it should not enjoy the immunity conferred by official sanctions. It should never be allowed to appear as anything but what it is.

The harmony between individual and

general interests is more profoundly true than classical theory imagined — but in reverse. It is not that individual selfishness makes for general good but that *unselfishness* makes for *personal* good. Classical theory is a fantastic travesty on Christ's teaching that he who would save his life must lose it.

VI.

What has happened in the world of business, I think, is this. Under the influence of the powerful secular movements of the eighteenth century, there developed a "rational" theory of business conduct based on a highly simplified concept of self-interest. While this theory justified and condoned many of the abuses and excesses which characterized the period of the industrial revolution, both here and abroad, it probably at no time ever operated without let or hindrance: moral considerations undoubtedly were always a limiting factor. Moreover, as time went on, these moral considerations came more and more to modify and reshape the actual conduct of businessmen, so that while the official explanations of business conduct underwent change slowly business practice underwent far more significant alteration. This is a dramatic example of the pervasive influence of religion in our society and its ability to penetrate every aspect of our lives.

The process of infusion, however, is far from complete. While it has modified conduct considerably, it has not yet developed a rationale of business practice specifically rooted in religion. Progress is being made in the direction of a more adequate description of the way business actually works — a description far more accurate than that provided by classical economic theory and its more modern versions — but this progress is largely in secular terms. But a secular rationale is not enough.

We need to define, much more clearly and explicitly than we have yet defined it, the intimate relationship between a man's religious faith and what he does in his business. We need to demonstrate that religion is just as relevant to the individual

in his office as in his home or church. Especially do we need to establish explicitly-understood Christian principles for the decision-makers of business, the officers and executives entrusted with the conduct of business affairs. The decisions they are required to make often require courage that can come only from conscious adherence to eternal verities, not the shifting sands of expediency. As human beings subject to pride and vanity, these decision-makers need the humility that comes from conscious subordination to Higher Will. As stewards of the welfare of others, they need the integrity that springs from a sense of responsibility to God and not merely to man. As frail vessels subject to the temp-

tations of avarice, they need the guiding and strengthening hand of a loving Father. They need, above all, a reinterpretation of Christian principles in terms of the totality of their experience, which includes the demands and pressures to which they are subject in the conduct of their business affairs.

This is a task in which the theologian and the preacher must take the lead. They will find many willing helpers and followers in the world of business, devout men deeply troubled and seeking greater relevance between their work and their faith. There is need for laymen and theologians to listen to each other, and to seek, through God's grace, the way He would have us go.

Religion in Current Magazines

C. R. House, Jr., Associate Professor, State College, Fairmont, W. Va.

Seventh-day Adventists: Continuing its series of stories on the religions of America, *Look*, June 24, '58, presents that of the Seventh-Day Adventist. The founding, beliefs, and present status of this group, and of the Millerites who preceded them, are interestingly portrayed by Hartzel Spence author of the entire series.

Literature and doctrine: Robert E. Spiller does an excellent book review in *The New York Times Book Review*, June 1, '58, of *American Literature and Christian Doctrine* by Randall Stewart.

Van Dusen: "Traditional Christians too often dismiss the churches of the third force disdainfully as the 'fringe sects,'" says Dr. Henry P. Van Dusen in *Life*, June 9, '58. This issue of *Life* features a 12-page article, copiously illustrated with photos, titled "The Third Force in Christendom" (Adventists to Pentecostals: Fastest-Growing Church Movement).

Ministry as vocation: Rev. Vernon Bigler presents a sermon on the ministry as a vocation, "A Thousand Lives to Live," in *Pulpit Digest*, June, '58.

Freedom or toleration?: In the same issue as above, Rev. Harold A. Bosley distinguishes between religious toleration and religious freedom in a sermon, "Religious Freedom is American Doctrine."

Era of good feeling: A new era of good feeling between Protestants and Roman Catholics is described in *Time*, June 2, '58, in reviewing the remarks of Rev. Gustave A. Weigel, one of the nation's top Catholic theologians, at the 48th annual convention of the Catholic Press Association in Richmond.

Paul Tillich: The sixth in a series (Adventures of the Mind) being presented by *The Saturday Evening Post*, June 14, '58, is written by Paul Tillich. Title: "The Lost Dimension in Religion."

Free society: Robert M. Hutchins writes on "Can a Free Society Survive?" in the *Bulletin*, May, '58, of the Fund for the Republic. Among other things he says, "Eccentric sects like Jehovah's Witnesses are interested in the freedom of religion, but they are not much interested in the freedom of the press or any of the rest of the Bill of Rights."

The Pope: J. D. Conway in *Catholic Digest*, June, '58, answers the question: Why all the grandeur given the Pope?

Labor-Management Relations and Religious Education

Victor Obenhaus

Associate Professor of the Church in Agricultural and Industrial Life, Federated Theological Faculty, University of Chicago

IN ASSOCIATING labor-management relations and religious education two assumptions must first be stated. 1) Labor-management relations are an inseparable part of our technological-industrial society. 2) Religion is of ultimate significance for industrial society as the condition in which contemporary man must live. Otherwise religion is irrelevant. These two presuppositions underlie any discussion of labor-management relations and religious education.

Others have delineated the forces creating, and the consequences of, an industrial society. Readers of *Religious Education* are familiar with its history. Not all of us, however, are as familiar with the issues involved in creating and operating an industrial society. We may be so close to them ourselves that we do not recognize them, nor have the social sciences yet clarified all their fundamental implications. The voluminous amount of scientific study and discovery in the realm of industrial relations attest to the fact that we are on the frontier of many new developments. It is coincident perhaps that this journal itself came into existence simultaneously with the realization that religion and the social sciences were not only related but that they were indispensable to the humanizing of the industrial order.

Only three years ago was there held the first — and preliminary — consultation on the churches and labor management relations. In the current year — 1958 — has been held the first major conference of this sort designated as a "Consultation on the Ministry of the Churches to Labor and Management." The National Council of Churches — Department of Church and Economic Life — sponsored the "Consultation." We are becoming increasingly ar-

ticulate and we hope competent, in our recognition of the relevance of social, ethical, religious understanding for labor-management relations.

A new science and set of skills have been emerging in relation to the human aspect of industry. The brass knuckles theory, developed first by industry and retaliated by labor, may still lurk in the background of much of the thinking of some negotiators and policy determiners but it has given way to the more civilized methods of honest bargaining. The National Planning Associations' studies of successful negotiating described under the caption "Causes of Industrial Peace" reveal progress. A wealth of literature and a roster of publications much too long to list here, reveal the maturation taking place in this strategic and fundamental area of modern society. Not of least importance, by any means, is the growing list of articles contending that the essence of this entire problem is religious in nature. There is the recognition of the fact that any attempted solution to human relations which omits a consideration of the nature and destiny of man is bound to be abbreviated and inconclusive. Here, then, is where religious education is involved.

A management consultant with clients scattered from coast to coast and in most of the industrial areas in between, commented recently, "our problems are increasingly theological and the issues we deal with have to be interpreted in terms of religion." This is not to say that all management people have yet recognized that the issues with which they are concerned have meanings in the very nature of man and society. But there is a growing company of individuals who are aware that this is the case. Those of us who know any considerable number of bona fide leaders of the newer type in

the labor movement know that they too have long since recognized the problems of industrial society to be basically spiritual problems.

The task of religious education then is four-fold. 1) The training of persons in the recognition that there is a fundamental unity to society within which all structures and programs operate. 2) Enabling individuals to develop sufficient understanding of themselves, their own motives and their inter-personal relations that they may deal rationally and understandingly with others who are similarly possessed of basic drives and intentions. 3) Helping people to recognize that the tough issues of life cannot be resolved by sentiment or goodwill alone but rather that there are rich reservoirs of information and technical assistance available for issues as complicated as those involved in labor-management relations. 4) Fostering the realization that power in itself is not bad and that in industrial society power must be analyzed, appraised and responsibly used.

1. Fortunately, we are being compelled to accept the fact of interrelatedness in the life of the world. Anxiety in Europe, for example, over the recession in America is but one of the countless illustrations which shout the meshing of economies and ideologies. Biblical history has contended this for thousands of years. Its deeper meaning is just beginning to dawn on the modern mind. We have almost accepted the fact that there can be no more local wars. Rarely can tensions be localized. The fact remains that tensions and conflicts are not necessarily evil in themselves — the evil appears in the way they are bungled. We start, however, with the assumption that strife and discord in one place have repercussions beyond local environs.

But some contend this doesn't help when you're up against a tough decision with a cantankerous opponent who has no such idealistic notion about the unity of society. Obviously, that is true. There are still many who were "dragged screaming into the twentieth century" or who can see nothing beyond the welfare of their own organiza-

tion and its concomitant benefits. We can only point to the rapidly mounting documentation of man's interdependence and his common cause.

In so brief a space it is impossible to spell out an adequate theology for such a conviction. It must suffice to say that if we do literally live and breathe in God we cannot successfully avoid the implication of this fact and we stand under continuous judgment because of it.

2. Labor-management relations are determined by the emotional equipment with which representatives approach a common problem. And it makes a deal of difference whether the representatives approach their common issue from a background of concern for the well-being of society as a whole. This is the essence of section 1. — above.

Religious education in our day conceives of its task as helping the individual to achieve emotional balance and an understanding of the forces which operate in interpersonal relations. The way one deals with matters involving tension is indicative of personal balance and one's capacity for maintaining perspective. Tension is at the heart of practically every labor-management controversy. The alternative is collusion, and the evils it brings may be worse in the long run than the tension it supplants. There is nothing wrong with honest labor-management tension any more than there is anything wrong with other inevitable tension situations. It is not the condition which is evil but rather the way the condition is met or resolved.

Religious educators know that growth in individuals or organizations does not ordinarily follow where all is sweetness and light. Character is the product of struggle. Labor unions which have sought to buy harmony without struggle are the ones which have grown flabby. The companies with which they supposedly bargained have, correspondingly, lost the right to represent free enterprise or to extol the merits of competition.

Commendable religious education presumably prepares individuals for dealing

with the kinds of situations which emerge at the bargaining table. Obviously, experiences of collective bargaining are not the only or major occasions for evidencing the finer fruits of religious education. But persons who are able to act with maturity and understanding in one situation will be morely likely to act the same way in other situations as well.

A religiously informed and educated person knows himself well enough to be able to recognize that which is disagreeable and offensive in his own make-up and manner. Theologically this is simply a capacity for accepting the fact that each of us is sinful. It is the recognition of the plank in one's eye while also aware of the splinter in his neighbor's.

There recently appeared in a metropolitan daily an affirmation of faith by a prominent business man. It was one of a series. His theme was "Integrity." Two groups were singled out as typifying the opposite of such a quality. One was the greedy laborers; the other the security-hungry farmers. For the religiously mature person confession begins with himself. The author of this affirmation, undoubtedly a man of integrity himself, reflects one of the fundamental problems of labor-management, i.e., a reluctance to acknowledge that all human associations have within them elements which impair integrity. This includes admission that all men are sinful and self righteous, including top executives who give affirmations of faith (And people who write articles about labor-management relations.)

One of the cardinal purposes of religious education is to confront men with their true selves and their natural tendency to find fault with others.

It must be very quickly and emphatically stated that another group easily prone to self righteousness are the clergy. So long have we been accustomed in our professional experience to give advice and pass judgment on the motives and practices of others that it may become even more difficult to recognize the plank in one's own eye. One would like to feel that the clergy

by virtue of familiarity with man's proclivity to self exculpation would recognize this tendency in themselves and make allowance for it in others. But it is all too evident that mere knowledge of native human tendencies, as seen in biblical illustrations, is no guarantee one has surmounted human failings. Correspondingly, one of the greatest joys in human relationships is to discover a person who acts permissively toward others and yet holds rigorous standards of integrity and achievement for himself.

No system or formula of training can guarantee to produce persons of such emotional maturity. We can, however, ask that the kind of religious education accorded individuals of whatever age enables them to develop such insights concerning themselves as would reveal their capacity to appropriate and exemplify the attainments of a truly understanding individual.

3. One of the unfortunate concomitants of certain types of pietism emerging from a limited biblical interpretation has been the too easy assumption that goodness and well-meaning would solve most problems. It is so trite to say this that one is tempted to eliminate it. Nevertheless, one only has to read the Monday morning's sermon digests, or the sermons whose publication some satisfied parishioner offered to subsidize, to realize that good intentions and personal righteousness are often deemed the sufficient equipment for most persons. Later when young people discover something of the involved and highly technical nature of the disciplines of social reconstruction they react wholeheartedly against their earlier training.

Could not a distinctive contribution be made in the realm of religious education by enabling young people, in particular, to realize that there are skills demanded for social amelioration and harmony which are comparable to the demands made in what are often thought the more exact sciences? The achievement of harmony in industrial relations is a contribution to the health of the body politic comparable to the elimination of a festering sore.

Technical skills in themselves are not the whole answer. Tempering and inspiring individuals with the kinds of influences found in Nos. 1 and 2 above, is indispensable. But at the same time dedicated ignorance can be disastrous too.

It is possible that the mid-twentieth century will be marked by the re-discovery of the Christian doctrine of vocation along with sputniks and atomic fission. Vocation is a revolutionary doctrine. From the standpoint of traditional occupational disciplines it has played havoc with the hierarchy of roles. Just as clergymen are receiving extensive training in the dynamics of industrial life, so industrial relations artists — or scientists — have grasped the fact that they are dealing with ultimates in individual and corporate living. Has ordination in one case made the individual more competent professionally? Or may it be that both men ministering to individual and corporate needs are truly priests to their neighbor? May it be possible that the re-discovery of Vocation is carrying with it a broadened ministry and a new field of service to man.

4. Nothing is more characteristic of technological society than the concentration of power. It is the very principle of industrialism. And where there is power there is a tendency toward increasing power.

Religious training of a previous day has looked askance at power and assumed that it was basically bad. But there has never been a society nor can there be without division of responsibility and a hierarchy of controls. Our type of society by virtue of the kind of physical power required to keep a technological society advancing must witness ever increasing concentrations. The question, of course, is where the checks are to be applied and on what basis.

Labor-management relations exemplify in themselves and are themselves the product of this very concentration. Rather than power being something from which religiously trained people would shy away it becomes a test of their faith.

Good labor-management relations assume the existence of collective bargaining. Col-

lective bargaining is the principal means available to labor in equalizing opportunities and dignifying the status of all persons involved. It is an indispensable instrument for restraining the conscious or unconscious exercise of power. Protestants, at least, with a preponderance of middle-class constituency and middle-class psychology have been slow to recognize the necessity for power restraints. It has been assumed that good men will, of course, deal with others benevolently and with full consideration of their rights and needs. A major contribution to the "Social Gospel" developed in a substantial measure out of the realization that a balancing of privilege was indispensable to any harmonious society and that churches made up largely of those who had been nurtured in the individualism of an expanding continent and the Protestant ethic had found it too much of an emotional wrench to relate their religious egalitarianism to the economic scene. It was not until a sufficient power force developed within the labor movement itself to challenge on a comparable basis the power of industry that the labor movement became accepted. In a study of religious and economic attitudes which we are conducting in a typical midwest county, we find that both town and farm people are now reconciled to the development of labor unions (and presumably collective bargaining). But almost uniformly is the comment added, "they go too far." The acceptance of the labor movement as a balancing influence is given with reluctance.

As the resolution of the National Council of Churches states,

"We believe the labor unions are responsible for the situation that has been revealed; so also the Christian Church. The degree and kind of responsibility may differ but we all share in the responsibility for what exists and also for what is done to correct it."

Then it goes on to add,

"This is the time for all citizens in every sphere of activity to examine the methods they employ in gaining wealth and in using power. We call upon Christians in meeting their responsibility as citizens, to strengthen the moral character of our society through

more effective participation in labor, management and government.¹

This sense of joint responsibility will, we trust, increase among thoughtful church people.

Almost all of the major denominations have committed themselves in favor of collective bargaining. Since no Protestant denomination is in a position to commit its entire constituency it must rely upon the level of civic intelligence and ethical concern of its people for enforcement and support of the stand which the denomination has taken. Inability of all denominations to put into effect their stated ideals, particularly in areas of the country where labor unionization is resisted, is serving as a further deterrent to evangelization of an industrial society. This presents religious educators and all who contend for the mission of the church with a dilemma and paradox. The church is committed to the extension of its life into the total experience of its people including, of course, their work experience. At the same time some wielders of considerable power who are themselves church members deny the opportunity for the equalizing of power and the granting of fuller democratic participation on the part of many who might logically be the interpreters and bearers of the church's mission itself. Confrontation with this paradox would eliminate some of the pretense and disingenuousness characterizing those who exercise unchallenged power.

At stake in this whole issue is the relevance of the church itself to contemporary society. Since contemporary society is overwhelmingly industrial and becoming more so with each decade, the ability of church people to comprehend what is involved in the development of responsible use of power becomes one of the major thrusts in religious life.

Up to this point we have been confining attention primarily to objectives and ideals.

¹Resolution on the Moral Crisis In the Labor Movement and in Labor Management Practices adopted by the Triennial General Assembly of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., December 5, 1957.

Eventually there must be considered the programs of implementation. In a real sense this is a task of religious education. Specifically, it involves substantial re-adjustment in the individual and social outlook of adult church constituents. On the national scale, both in cooperative church life and in the several denominations, much headway has already been made. The problem now is primarily at the local level.

Perhaps first of all is the necessity for providing a climate in which there can be discussed fairly the full gamut of the problems of industrial society. There is no more likely place for the consideration of contentious issues than in an institution whose very life hinges upon its capacity for being a redemptive fellowship.²

No other institution has the resources or the opportunities afforded to religious education to help people understand their daily work in terms of vocation. Battling for power or to secure equality of rights may be an essential political aspect of group life but ultimately the issues will not be resolved on the basis of an armed truce or a delicate balancing of power. Fundamentally, the question has to be asked as to the purpose for which goods are produced and human effort expended. Already there are existing in this country religiously-oriented centers, conducted either by a denomination or church people from several denominations, designed to provide a place in which people from many walks and activities of life may discuss the meaning of their labors. These are in some instances patterned after the Evangelical Academies of Europe. The latter frequently had to come into existence because the church was incapable of providing a center for just such exploration and discussion. Where adult education has been as commonly accepted as it is in this country a study program or exploration and discussion groups, built around the concept of one's vocation and the reconciling of differences, may

²I am borrowing substantially here from the discussion in the above mentioned "Consultation on the Ministry of the Churches to Labor and Management."

more readily find congenial home in the church itself.

One of the major hindrances to comprehensive and intelligent consideration of the issues of industrial life lies in the lassitude and indifference of working people themselves. The apparent prosperity (despite recession) anaesthetizes people of all walks of life so that any disposition to analyze fundamental problems is dulled. One of the contributions of religious education at this point would certainly be to lift up just such a situation and point prophetically to its consequences.

In smaller communities where an individual church or group of churches working together can deal with the total moral and spiritual quality of the community's life, it is possible to sensitize a large percentage of the population with the significance of the tone or quality prevailing in that community. If religious leaders themselves see the community as educator of its people they recognize that the quality of education hinges largely on the cooperative relationships of all segments. Though, theoretically, this should be easier to accomplish in a small community, it is also

sometimes true that the animosities are greater because of the proximity.

Perhaps all of this can best be summed up in the assumption that truly religiously-minded people, whether laity or clergy, are committed to understand and interpret the wholeness of life. For Protestants this means a re-awakening or a re-discovery of the church as the redemptive community. Roman Catholicism obviously does not have to face this problem in quite the same way for by its parish system it already includes the total gamut of those living within its parish. Protestantism, on the other hand, by the very nature of its selective process, tends to uniformity of economic ideology. And a one-class constituency makes appreciation of contrary points of view the more difficult. Perhaps Protestantism's greatest contribution will be at the point of making possible the sharing of contrary opinions, recognizing differences held even where love prevails and making a convincing exposition of the Christian faith's inseparable involvement with the meaning of life for all men in an industrial society. Labor-management relations can come to maturity in such a climate.

RELIGION IN CURRENT MAGAZINES (Continued)

Discipline: (in the church school). This perennial problem is discussed, with some excellent pointers, by Alice L. Goddard in *International Journal of Religious Education*, June, '58. (It is always difficult to select one article for listing in this column from the International Journal; all are good).

• • • • •
Cogley: Writing in *The Commonweal*, May 30, '58, John Cogley writes on the difficulties of pluralism in our society. Asking What is Americanism? he proceeds to answer, finding that answer more in experience than in logic. Well worth reading.

• • • • •
Religion in the Public Schools: Someone, and thanks, has sent the conductor of this column a copy of *The Study of Religion in the Public Schools—An Appraisal*. This is a 229-page report of a conference on Religion and public education sponsored by the American Council on Education at Arden House, Harriman, New York, March 10-12, '57.

• • • • •
Great revivalists: Samuel T. Williamson reviews in *New York Times Book Review*, May 25, '58, *They Gathered at the River*, by Bernard A. Weisberger. This is the story of the great revivalists from Billy Sunday up to, but not mentioning, Billy Graham.

III

Morality and Administration in Labor-Management Relations

Kermit Eby

Professor of the Social Sciences, University of Chicago

IN LABOR-MANAGEMENT relations, as in all human relations, obsequiousness is debasing. So is condescension. Only a relationship between men which accepts their integrity as men is worthy of emulation. In this world which could be termed a good society there would be no elites and no men of low estate, no masters and no slaves. For masters who violate their slaves must in turn accept violation by those above them, as Roman history so vividly attests.

Because the Romans regarded slavery as the basic institution of society, there was nothing that might prompt their minds and hearts to say "no" to a man who claimed to have owners' rights over them; nothing, either, that might say "no" to the man's heirs, whose property the slaves became by inheritance. From this situation, then, came so many of the cowardly acts whose enumeration sickened Tacitus, all the more so since he had shared in them. A Roman might commit suicide upon receiving an order to do so; a slave could not commit suicide, because that would be robbing the master. Caligula, historians tell us, had standing behind him at his meals a row of senators wearing tunics. (The tunic was the characteristic mark of slavery.) At banquets, Caligula also had the habit of absenting himself for a quarter of an hour to take a noblewoman to bed with him, and then bring her back to join the other guests, among whom was her husband. But these people, who beat not only their slaves, but their colonial peoples, had no other course but to accept their own violation.

If the Romans made slavery divine, we have the tendency to make the boss divine. In the psychological sense, we too, are often slaves. Note the number of John L. Lewis' and Herbert Kohler's active on the Ameri-

can scene; that is, note the number of out and out despots. These people are despots to whom their fellow men are merely numbers in the production or dues-paying process. We all know this sort of overtly hostile and deeply authoritarian type; we look upon a certain kind of wilfulness in American life as colorful (our inquisitor into the institution of "rugged individualism.")

And yet what does the existence of such types really signify?

Take the case of a metals company in Michigan, which during the summer of 1954 decided to liquidate its assets, that is, go out of business. An official of the company was delegated to talk to the members of the CIO union organized in the plant concerning liquidation. The Michigan CIO Council happened to take this man's speech down on tape.

The Company official could hardly control the glee in his voice when he announced that not only did the company intend to liquidate its assets, but the jobs of the workers also. It's because of you guys, the official said in effect, that we're going out of business. You've got too many old men puttering around the shop, and you make us keep them on because they've got high seniority. You've given us too much trouble; why every time one of your guys wakes up on the wrong side of the bed, you gotta strike! Well, this is it boys. We're pulling out and leaving you high and dry, because this company is responsible to its stockholders and not to you!

The heart of the moral dilemma here is simple: the workers at the metals company, like workers almost everywhere, did not own their own job; rather the "job" or the employer who gave them the job owned them in the financial sense; or the employer

despised them because they sought to establish a vested interest in their job through the union.

Let us take an illustration from another area of what we euphemistically call these days "human relations." Saul Alinsky, in his authorized biography of John L. Lewis, describes the break between Lewis and Philip Murray after thirty years of collaboration, thirty years during which Lewis commanded and Murray obeyed. Breaking with Lewis was one of the most traumatic experiences of Murray's life. For months Murray was physically and psychically ill. Only the constant affirmation that he, too, "was a man" gave him any sort of self-reassurance. And long after the break, "Lewis remained the ruling force in Murray's life, either because of Murray's previous allegiance, or by his later all-consuming hatred." One of the bitterest oaths I have ever heard one man use against another came from Murray in castigation of Lewis when Lewis sent his daughter, Catherine, to Grand Rapids to ask Bishop Haus to use his good offices in negotiations for labor unity.

It is obvious that men who consent to being slaves for a long period of time find it difficult indeed to call their souls their own. It may be apocryphal, but there is a story to the effect that John L. Lewis sent the wife of one of his staff a dozen roses on their first wedding anniversary in atonement for his absence at the wedding. Flowers for the subservient, but professional death for the independent, has always been a law of despots. It isn't all apocryphal, but a known fact, that corporations are increasingly demanding the loyalty of their executives' wives.

Three times in my life I have been dismissed, voluntarily left, or stood trial in organizations because of organizational violation of the principles which, supposedly, the organization itself represented. I defended the individual men against institutions because it is the man who dies, the man who suffers, and the man who creates.

"If thy brother has aught against you," Jesus taught, "go to him and be reconciled; if he refuses, take a brother with you." The

responsibility lies in winning the brother, and not the argument. Morality in the administration of labor-management, it would seem, is somehow related to our ability to deal with men rather than abstractions, and to place human values above institutional ones.

My early background in the Brethren Church has left me with a prejudice against titles and hierarchical designations generally. Among the Brethren and the Mennonites there were no titles except Brother and Sister. Even those fraternal titles have become frothy and insincere through their use among Rotarians and other service club members. Among the Brethren, however, the most significant of religious experiences was the Lord's Supper, which included, among us, the washing of feet. In this ceremony we symbolically reaffirmed our brotherhood, and recreated the concept of the suffering servant in our own lives. True humility is "the kind which identifies us with our fellow man, not the kind that demands their subservience."

I think that this need to identify, to become part of, other human beings, is more than an ethical concept. It is an actual need, often suppressed or overlooked or cheapened and commercialized, but a need, which to varying degree and intent, is in all of us. In rare individuals it may have the quality of an obsession; it becomes the need to *be* the other person; it borders on the saintly or the demonic. One of the stories told about St. Vincent de Paul is that once he happened to be on a galley as a traveller from one place to another. On the top deck of the galley were all more or less respectable and wealthy men and women, symbolic of The World. The top deck riders always try to remain, or actually are unaware of those below-deck workers and slaves upon whom their particular position rests. St. Vincent, of course, was not unaware; he went below decks with the galley slaves, and he took away the oars of one of the slaves dying from overwork, and *rowed for him*.

Nor do I think that this need to identify totally with other human beings is confined only to the greatest saints or greatest sin-

ners. It is seen in the tortured reminiscences of writers like Arthur Koestler, whose experience in the Communist Party was one long frustrated desire to absolve himself of both personal and impersonal guilt. Andre Gide, whose guild, like Koestler's, was based in part on an upper middle class upbringing, gave up membership in the Party, not because Communism treated him badly, but because it treated him too well. As a visiting Big Fish, a foreign celebrity, Gide was given the same preferential treatment that he was trying to escape in the capitalist societies in Europe.

As realists, as "hard-headed" men we so often, when we talk about labor-management (especially about labor-management which we conceive of as such a cold, calculated process) underestimate both man's need to identify with other men and his need for idealism. Yet today we know too much about the hidden springs of action — or at least we have been able to guess enough — to be satisfied with the simple, selfish Hobbesian explanations of man's behavior. We know about such things as self-defeat, for example, we know that it takes a very well-integrated person indeed (or a very sick one) to be able to *work for himself alone*. We know a little about the close correlations between vanity and self-abasement, between the desire to identify and loneliness, between the desire to give and the fear of human closeness.

The chief fault of most bureaucracies somehow lies in the area of non-recognition of these paradoxical facts relating to the human material; it lies in a certain clumsiness of the intelligence. A bureaucracy must, by its very nature, view man as an animal to be manipulated. But the manipulation is seldom very subtle; the effects of intense manipulation of large numbers of men may be perfectly horrible, as under the Nazi regime, or amazingly stultifying and depressing, as under the Soviets; or simply confusing and demoralizing, as so often in our country. In the United States, we have not dealt so far with state-instigated Terror as a means to manipulation; we have dealt with silence, censorship, and

distortion or suppression of facts. The McCarthys and Jenners never seemed as great a threat to our liberties as the well-meaning bureaucrat who is afraid to let the people know the truth, on the assumption that this withholding of facts is for our own protection. It is too dangerous, these men feel, to reveal the actual dangers of hydrogen bomb warfare.

I remember helping coin the phrase "slave labor" bill to describe the Taft-Hartley Act; I thereupon had the unpleasant experience of hearing people parrot the phrase without knowing anything at all about Taft-Hartley. Likewise, most labor educators are insistent upon a two-party system and open caucuses in national and state elections, while unquestioningly accepting their own one-party, monolithic union structure. Suppression of information, slogan-making, and a kind of double-think on issues constitute the main temptations of the bureaucratic existence; the nature of these temptations explains why to such a large extent bureaucracies which cannot use the crudest methods of blood and terror are so often ineffective and clumsy. (Terrors are clumsy, too, stupid, irrational, and all the rest, but always with hideous effect.) The kind of bureaucracy we in the United States know creates in most of us a feeling of apathy or confusion. We feel more and more that we cannot effect our national destiny either through the administrative structure, nor yet outside of it.

I think it has always been difficult, but not entirely impossible to give meaning to the Judeo-Christian ethic and the world of labor-management relations, which in our time grows ever further and further removed from those affected by the power. The attempts to solve this equation in our time have not been particularly successful. Cooperatives and unions depend upon power relationships and status differentials. The attempt at a kind of communitarian outlook as represented by the American concept of Suburbia has only resulted in a new and more colorless kind of conformity. Small communities bound together in a

common ideal of the Good Society was a Brethren idea; I do not think that that idea has any possibility for existence in today's world. However, it should be understood that the present alternative to this ideal which is given us is the increasingly de-personalization of man. That de-personalization seems to negate both real individualism and really deep identification with groups. The intensity of small in-group feelings and factionalism somehow seems to us to be clannish or sectarian, or unrealistic. The Brethren envisaged a community of communities, in turn built out of ever smaller communities, the basic cell being the cooperative and the family. The Brethren would have agreed with Martin Buber:

Individualism understands only a part of man, collectivism understands man only as a part. Individualism sees man only in relation to himself, but collectivism does not see man at all; it sees society.

These are ideas which have played a large part in radical Catholic social thinking, and which are beginning to influence Protestant thought as well.

Idealist and communitarian I may be; yet I continue to live in Chicago instead of abandoning the World as such and moving to a Bruderhof in Paraguay or a Hutterite community in the Dakotas. First, I don't have the courage to make such a move; and secondly, I believe that there are no islands, and that two or three ideal communities scattered here and there over the world will not solve the problem. Again, it is the very old dilemma of trying to bring what exists more in line with what should exist.

Since most decisions have to be made in the world that does exist, I should say that it is better that the sensitive and idealistic get in a position to make them. One of the pious once asked me: "What are you, a Brethren, doing as Research and Education Director of CIO?" I replied: "Not that I am so good, but the others are often so awful." At least I was not caught up in the mass-man delusion of those who extol society and yet despise or ignore the individual members who compose it.

My own policy in labor-management was to attempt to build around (1) joint decision; (2) open channels of communication; and (3) shared benefits.

Beginning with the first, the idea is increasingly advanced that joint decision is too Utopian in the world of large organization and delegated powers. With this I disagree. My experience in World War II with labor-management production committees strengthened my conviction. Motivated by the necessity to defeat Hitlerian fascism, we introduced a bit of democracy in the industrial process, only to discover that it worked, and that there was a direct correlation between the degree of cooperation and productivity increases. Ironically, once Hitler was defeated, there was less need for joint discussion, and cooperation was abandoned as too Utopian. However, post-war studies of industrial peace confirm the experience of wartime.

Both in the Chicago Teachers Union (as executive secretary from 1937 to 1942) and in the CIO I found that if you make your supervisory office accessible, if you have time to give ear to grievances, that very act relieves tensions within the organization. The good steward was the fellow who left his channels of communication open on a two-way level: between his men and the foreman. The history of Ford's transition to industrial peace is the history of the demise of Harry Bennett and his strong arm spies, and the introduction of a functioning stewardship system.

Because I believe in shared benefits, I have always argued for open book negotiations. Without all the facts, it is impossible to develop responsible unions, for one cannot negotiate in a vacuum. Open negotiations naturally lead to some form of profit sharing (a study unto itself.) Oddly enough, the greatest difficulty I ever had in making the point of shared benefits was before a group of Mennonite business men who were willing to give Christmas bonuses, but absolutely unwilling to negotiate them with their workers, even the workers who were fellow churchmen. In

this case, the paternalistic drive overcame the communitarian.

In the CIO I was head of a department which was responsible to the President alone. Inasmuch as Phillip Murray believed in delegated responsibility, departments in CIO were virtually autonomous. Murray could fire me at will, but since he had absolute power in his kingdom, I had the same kind of power in mine. Paradoxically, it was this situation which enabled me to test my theories. Whenever possible, I hired staffmen who shared my viewpoint, and who understood what I wanted to do. Since much of the staff was inherited, it was necessary to blend the convinced and the unconvinced. This was done by holding open staff meetings, meetings which included the lowliest secretary on up. We had no secrets; our ambition was to create a situation in which it was assumed that intelligence was the monopoly of no one person. To insure that all information was available, both office and executive correspondence was available to everyone. If individuals act upon their knowledge, they must be assured that their actions will be supported. There can be no buck-passing. But even more significantly, everyone responsible for a memo, or testimony, or speech, must receive credit for his work. I did not, as Department Head, play the game of omniscience. I read my assistants' drafts; collaborated with them, but our superiors knew that these were joint efforts. (In University circles Professors are not above copying their students' research without giving credit. More than once students have come to me to tell me about such incidents; their feeling was that they deserved at least a footnote.)

In CIO I found it necessary to try to develop clear and open understanding concerning salaries, raises, and rewards, such as trips to conventions. Tangible rewards are important, but a salary increase does not necessarily insure better teachers, boiler-

makers, or representatives in Congress. Nor is, by the same token, leisure an end in itself. It becomes annoying when churches are judged by buildings and membership increases, not by dedication or prophecy. And successful union men are often concerned with being more ostentatious than their corporation counterparts.

My basic desire then, as an administrator in labor-management was to insist that labor apply its own ethic, to establish an atmosphere of trust and fairness. I am assured now that people work much better in such an atmosphere; furthermore, it seems to me difficult to work with men whose word you cannot trust.

My whole argument may be summarized, then, in the fact that in administration in labor-management as well as elsewhere, the idealist may often prove the most practical of men, that is, if he has the control and knowledge to be able effectively to work in the world as it is. In Martin Buber's words again: "A drop of Messianic consummation must be mingled with every honor, otherwise, the hour is godless, despite all piety and devoutness." That man does not live by bread alone is confirmed in our time, not merely by religious and artistic insight, but by such relatively new concepts of man as the theory of psychoanalysis.

The idealist in administration, as in all human relations, is he who keeps the vision in mind even though beset by failure. When the Bible announces a successful deed, "it is duty bound to announce in complete detail the failure involved in the success." Moses' life was a succession of disappointments, "and yet his work survives also in a hope which transcends all failures."

The true idealist wants not only to be right, but for the right reasons, so that in all administrative relations he must affirm man as an end, an end whose destiny is dignity, because he is man created in the image of God.

The Synagogue and Labor Relations

Eugene J. Lipman

Director, Commission on Synagogue Activities, Union of American Hebrew Congregations

I

JUDAISM is a many-stranded fabric with a single purpose. Its purpose was proclaimed at Mt. Sinai, when the Children of Israel responded to God's demands on them with a resounding and eternal: "We shall do and we shall hear." What did the Jewish people covenant to do? What did and does God demand of us?

The prophet Micah answered these questions simply in the oft-quoted verse:

"It hath been told thee, O man, what is good, and what the Lord doth require of thee: to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God." (6:8)

Several implications of this prophetic answer are relevant to our subject:

1. As Judaism views him, man's purpose in life is to fulfill God's will.

2. For Judaism, God's will centers about His moral law. As Rabbi Leo Baeck, probably the greatest of 20th century rabbis, put it: "No matter when one fixes the date of Israel's birth and no matter what view one may take of its development, one thing is certain: its predominant aspect from the very beginning was its ethical character, the importance it attached to the moral law. Ethics constitute its essence. Monotheism is the result of a realization of the absolute character of the moral law; moral consciousness teaches about God." (*The Essence of Judaism*)

3. It follows from the above that Judaism must be expressed and fulfilled primarily in society, in our relationships with other men.

Because Judaism has always taught that God, the Creator "who renews daily the work of creation," works through law, our quest for ever-deepening knowledge of Him and of His will has been expressed in

Halacha, in law. The totality of God's teachings, His instructions to us as we understand them in law — this we call *Torah*. In Judaism, there can be made no distinction between the secular and the sacred — for there is no secular. God's teachings cover every aspect of man's life on earth, no matter how mundane. Every act can be and should be an act of devotion, sacred.

In this constellation of concepts and principles, it should be unnecessary even to state that Judaism has always placed human beings and human values far above property and property values. In Biblical law, debts were cancellable every seven years, and at the *Yovel*, the Jubilee, "proclaiming liberty throughout the land" included freedom for all Hebrew slaves and the return to all families of lands originally their patrimony. Changes in these laws in later Rabbinic teachings were made only for the betterment of man, not for the greater protection of property.

A wine merchant once asked two porters to bring him a keg of wine from the market, the Talmud tells us. On the way, the keg fell and the wine was spilled. The merchant took their cloaks to pay for the lost wine, and refused to reimburse them for their time and labor. A rabbinical court ruled that the cloaks had to be returned and their wages paid. Their need was the paramount consideration. In Judaism, man's need must always be paramount.

II

From Biblical times to the present day, Judaism has had much to say, and its adherents much to do about work and workers. Even most Biblical writers did not accept the early concept that work is a curse. "When thou eatest the labor of thy hands,

happy shalt thou be, and it shall be well with thee." (Psalm 128:2) "Great is work, for it honors its master." (Talmud) These statements epitomize the attitude of traditional Judaism toward work.

Every Jew was commanded to teach his son a trade as well as the *Torah*. It was deemed proper to divide one's waking hours evenly between *Torah*, prayer, and work. Work had to be conscientiously performed. The Talmud tells of Rabbi Abba Joseph, who was a carpenter. Once a Jew came to his place of work to ask a major question of him, to seek his counsel. Abba Joseph declined to come down from the scaffolding to answer the inquiry: "I can't come down because I am hired by the day."

Jewish law was most solicitous for the rights and dignity of workers. In the spirit of the Biblical injunctions, detailed laws were evolved with regard to wage rates (local custom prevailed), time of paying, supplementary compensation (overtime), adjudication of disputes between employer and employee, and similar matters. In general, these laws were liberal even by 20th century standards.

Jewish craftsmen were organized very early in post-Biblical decades, if not during the end of the Biblical period itself. In Palestine, Alexandria, and elsewhere, guilds of craftsmen either had their own synagogues, or special sections within the synagogue. They worked together in certain ways much as the craft unions of our day still do. There were agreements about staggering days of work, sales prices on baked goods, and conditions of work. Collective bargaining as we know it does not appear to have been practiced, however.

III

As Jews became increasingly isolated in the dark ghettos of medieval Europe, the laws of the *Torah* regarding what we now call labor relations became internalized, as did practically all of Judaism. With ghetto walls, Jews studied *Torah* and tried to practice it in all their dealings. But there was no larger society in which to practice social justice. They never were admitted to the craft guilds of the Christian working com-

munity. In fact, except for merchants, Jew and Christian rarely met — not as fellow-workers, not as employer and employee.

Only with the development of democratic freedom in Western Europe and in the New World in the 18th century did Jews once again get an opportunity to apply the ageless wisdom of the *Torah* to daily working relationships in society-at-large. But even in the United States, the opportunity came slowly. For the first two hundred years of their residence on this continent, Jews were primarily concerned with their own Americanization and with the acquisition of primary civil and economic rights. (It was only in 1876 that the last civil disability against Jews was removed — in New Hampshire). Economic standards and relationships of Jews tended to follow those of their surroundings.

IV

After the Civil War, however, with the hard-fought beginnings of organized trade unionism in this country, Jews undertook two distinct roles in the labor movement. A few Jews assumed positions of leadership in labor, led by Samuel Gompers, British-born Jewish cigarmaker who headed the American Federation of Labor for many years. But most Jewish workers headed into predominantly Jewish unions. They were newly-arrived immigrants from Eastern Europe, they spoke no English, and they were still frightened from Polish and Russian pogroms. For them, the all-Jewish trade union became a way of life, especially in the garment trades which absorbed tens of thousands of them in a few short decades. The United Hebrew Trades organization involved, a few years ago, some ninety different unions.

In general, the Jewish unions had the same aims as all trade unions, and they fought the same battles as their comrades. The general strike in the garment industry in 1910 is worth noting. It was a unique battle. Strikers and sweat-shop operators were close relatives in many cases, almost all were immigrants, almost all were Yiddish-speaking, and all were living proof of Jewry's legendary stiffneckedness. A great

Jew — Louis D. Brandeis — was able to settle that strike, and brought decades of peace to an exemplary industry, with two exemplary Jewish-led unions.

But our subject is the synagogue in labor relations, not Jews in this field. Where was the American synagogue during the late 19th century and early decades of the 20th century, as labor fought for its rights and worked to democratize the American economy? The answer is simple and sad — the synagogue *qua* synagogue was silent. Like most American religious institutions during this period, the American synagogue reached an historic low point of effectiveness in social justice as in other facets of its traditional functions. Thousands of Jewish workers did not belong to the synagogue at all; they became socialists, Zionists, anarchists, everything but religious Jews. Secular agencies took over — by default — many traditional functions of the religious institution: social welfare, civic leadership and social justice. The synagogue, core of Judaism, gave up its position of centrality in Jewish life for several decades. As one rabbi has put it, "between 1870 and 1890 Judaism was still content to believe in progress rather than to take steps to further it." (Rabbi Leonard Mervis in *American Jewish Archives*, Vol. VII, No. 2, page 172)

In fairness, it should be noted that it was difficult for any clergymen or religious institution to speak out for any social causes in those wild days of rugged individualism. Once, when a committee of religious leaders offered to arbitrate a coal strike, their offer was rejected with the remark: "Anthracite mining is a business and not a religious, sentimental, or academic proposition." (Harold U. Faulkner, *The Quest for Social Justice*, Macmillan 1931, p. 153) And so the synagogue joined the church in rather generalized preaching about morality, with societal expressions limited to philanthropy and emerging social service.

But many rabbis did not so limit themselves, and neither did rabbinical organizations. Individual rabbis have worked closely with organized labor, have served as conciliators and arbitrators in labor disputes,

have played major roles in labor relations, both in word and in deed. Though precise statistics are not available, not less than 45 American rabbis have so occupied themselves during recent decades.

The first of the great voices for social justice in the American rabbinate was Emil G. Hirsch of Chicago. Though the range of his social concerns was tremendous, the plight of the worker was paramount in his thoughts and work. He inveighed against the seven-day week, against the sweatshop, for social security and unemployment benefits. Before 1910, he declared himself in favor of organized labor and collective bargaining. Rabbi Hirsch jeopardized his own status by defending collective bargaining in large industrial firms in Chicago, owners of which were his own congregants. In 1919, he joined Rabbi Stephen S. Wise of New York in rebuking publicly the giant concern, calling the strike a justifiable rebellion against company obstinacy. A great orator, Rabbi Hirsch's voice was a strong one when few strong voices were to be heard.

Rabbi Stephen S. Wise has been characterized as a "latter-day Isaiah," and the appellation is not an inaccurate one. When he took oratorical aim on civic corruption, or child labor, or any form of social injustice, his thundering voice was heard and its impact felt. He was outraged by the horrible Triangle Fire in a New York factory in 1911. He led the movement for remedial legislation. He joined Paul W. Kellogg to pressure President Taft into appointing a presidential commission on industrial relations. In 1912, Rabbi Wise mediated a lockout in some Pennsylvania textile mills. Though his efforts were unsuccessful, the conditions he uncovered were added grist for his crusading zeal. Public censure did not stop Rabbi Wise, nor did occasional resignations by affluent members of his Free Synagogue, as occurred when he raised his voice against the United States Steel Corporation, and demanded that they recognize the union of their workers. Wise stands second to none as a prophetic voice in American Israel.

Several more names must be mentioned among the many distinguished rabbis who have served the cause of industrial statesmanship and labor stability. Though known chiefly for his fervid pacifism and devotion to many causes, Rabbi Abraham Cronbach played a major role in the development of the social justice movement in American Judaism in general, and in increasing awareness of organized labor in particular. As Professor of Social Studies at the Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, for a generation, he worked tirelessly and with utter devotion to teach his students not only the ethical principles of Judaism, but practical techniques for putting principles to work in every possible situation, from the picket line to the legislative hall and the synagogue social action committee.

Before his untimely death in 1941, Rabbi Edward L. Israel of Baltimore had accomplished much in the field of labor relations. He was a member of the Maryland Labor Relations Board, and served for a long time as permanent arbitrator of the garment industry of Baltimore. As chairman of the Commission on Social Justice of the Central Conference of American Rabbis, he led a number of the crusades to be enumerated herein. His death, just as he was to assume leadership of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, stilled a voice and a spirit which already had been of inestimable value in exemplifying Jewish religious principles.

In recent years, rabbis have continued to work closely for industrial peace. The writer joined a priest and minister in an unsuccessful attempt to mediate the long-standing, bitter Kohler strike. More successful in a similar effort in 1957 was Rabbi Eli Cooper of York, Pennsylvania, who joined in mediation efforts which ended the York-Hoover Company strike in his community, and earned widespread commendation.

It is a source of pride to the Jewish community that the first chairman of the Public Review Board established by the United Auto Workers' union has been Rabbi Morris Adler of Detroit. Two other clergymen

serve with him and four distinguished laymen in this radical experiment in union democracy and statesmanship, and the successful beginnings of their work will mean much to the American labor movement in our time.

V

It is always difficult to measure the impact of organizational pronouncements and statements. It is not overstating the case, however, to indicate that the Central Conference of American Rabbis (Reform) and, in the past twenty years, the Rabbinical Assembly of America (Conservative) have had real influence on the thinking of American Jewry with regard to forward-looking labor relations, and have, in addition, played significant roles on occasion in the practical solutions of industrial problems.

The CCAR began to express its concern about child labor and sweatshops before 1910. Its 1918 social justice platform contained fourteen clauses which placed this body in the vanguard of American thought in the field of labor relations: minimum wage, eight hour day, workmen's compensation, universal health insurance, collective bargaining, mediation and arbitration principles, public housing for workers — all these were enunciated by the rabbis forty years ago!

The Conference took its pronouncements seriously. It joined the then-Federal Council of Churches and the National Catholic Welfare Conference in an investigation of the steel industry's refusal to establish minimally-decent hours of work. With the same partners, they investigated the Western Maryland Railroad strike of 1926. A year later, the Real Silk Hosiery workers' plight brought an on-the-spot investigation. In 1929, the three-faith group again went into action in the field, and played a major role in the paroling of the members of the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW) who had been given severe prison sentences following the 1919 Armistice Day riot in Centralia, Washington.

Though three-faith cooperation in industrial relations on an organizational basis has not been undertaken in recent years, the pat-

tern has made it acceptable for individual clergymen and three-faith teams to render great service in this area.

Rabbinical organizations have continued to record their views — against the Taft-Hartley Law, in favor of the AFL-CIO merger, heartily endorsing the internal house-cleaning of unions, and in related areas.

VI

In contrast with rabbinical organizations, synagogal unions have had little to say about labor relations. The Union of American Hebrew Congregations passed a resolution opposing child labor in 1909. Its next pronouncement on labor relations came thirty-nine years later, when a general resolution on the domestic scene included commendation of labor for the gains it had made over the years.

The anomalous gap between the role of the synagogue — near-silence — and the activity of religious leaders could not possibly continue indefinitely. Within both Reform and Conservative Jewish ranks, there had been increasingly loud and frequent calls for congregational social action. In 1953, the Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism went to work; two years later the Conservative movement undertook a similar program. Orthodox Ju-

daism has a national commission in the general social justice area, but little local activity.

Significant strides have been taken since 1953 in making the concern of the synagogue for labor relations and every other facet of social action a functioning reality. The Reform Jewish movement boasts of some 250 social action committees in local synagogues. They study and act upon every manner of issue and problem. Local groups are multiplying with some rapidity within Conservative Judaism. The synagogue as an entity has ended its silence and is reasserting its place of leadership as the exemplar of Jewish ethical ideals as well as its teacher. Rabbi and layman together, studying carefully and acting deliberately, can do much to make of American industrial society a harmonious and forward-looking unity. For despite all the progress which has been made, there is much work yet to be done, both for organized labor and within organized labor, both to help industry and business learn more about labor statesmanship and to help labor practice internal democracy and statesmanship. American Judaism, through its synagogues and national religious institutions, will do the job expected of it by its heritage.

RELIGION IN CURRENT MAGAZINES (Continued)

In natural waters: The belief of Southern Baptists in immersion in natural waters only is briefly told but illustrated with a two-page color photo of a baptismal scene in *Saturday Evening Post*, May 17, '58.

* * * * *

Hindu vs. Moslem: The problems of India, religious and otherwise, are detailed in *Look*, May 27, '58. Copiously illustrated with color photos.

* * * * *

Zen priest: The story of an American who became a Zen priest in Buddhism is related in *Time*, May 26, '58.

* * * * *

Soul prober: "He probes the human soul," says Ernest O. Hauser writing about Carl G. Jung, famous Swiss psychiatrist, in *Saturday Evening Post*, May 24, '58. Throughout the Western world, he says, there is a growing interest in Jung's ideas among churchmen. . . .

* * * * *

Bertocci: If you are concerned with theology you will not want to miss Peter A. Bertocci's latest article in *The Journal of Religion*: "Toward a Clarification of the Christian Doctrine of Grace and the Moral Life," April 1958 issue. See also his January, 1958, article: "Does the Concept of Christian Love Add Anything to Moral Philosophy?" in the same journal.

Current Labor Problems

George G. Higgins

Director, Social Action Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference

IN PREPARING for the observance of Labor Day last year, we came across an old photograph of the building in which the American labor movement — as we know it today — held its first convention in 1886: a modest little store-front building located at 180 South Fourth Street in Columbus, Ohio.

It occurred to us at the time that if it is still standing, that little building ought to be preserved as a sort of national monument, a place of pilgrimage to which future generations of American trade unionists might repair at their leisure to catch the spirit or to get the feel of the labor movement.

It is good for all of us, as individuals and as members of organizations, to remember where we came from and to go back to our place of origin now and then lest we forget the sacrifices which were made by our forebears and our predecessors on our behalf and which alone have made it possible for us to achieve success in our various undertakings. There is nothing in the world more pitiful than the sight of a man who has become so flushed by unexpected and perhaps undeserved success or prosperity as to be embarrassed by or ashamed of his humble origins and unmindful of the debt of gratitude he owes to his family and his friends. Similarly it would be the height of folly and conceit for the living members of an organization, and particularly an organization of workingmen, to forget the contributions of those who have gone before them, the hardy pioneers who bore the burden and the heat of the day and by their sacrifices made it possible for the organization to survive and prosper.

Frankly there is reason to fear that this may be happening, to some extent at least, within the ranks of organized labor at the present time. It is our impression, in other

words, that too many of the newer members of the labor movement, the youngsters or Johnny-come-latelies, are like spoiled children who have had everything handed to them on a silver platter. They know very little, if anything, about the history and the early struggles of the labor movement, and they have inherited very little of the spirit of sacrifice which characterized its founders. They pay their union dues more or less willingly, but they seldom attend a union meeting. They are only nominal trade unionists — like the nominal members of a church who come to services on Christmas and Easter and complacently let it go at that.

This problem of rank-and-file apathy or indifference in the labor movement is the subject of a recent book entitled *The Local Union — Its Place In the Industrial Plant*, written by George Strauss and Leonard R. Sayles. According to the authors of this important study, which was based on a series of personal interviews, "The overwhelming majority" of the rank-and-file are "sold" on their local union as a protective organization. They willingly support its economic activities as useful and necessary and almost unanimously agree that "without a union we would be lost." On the other hand, a large percentage of the rank-and-file — perhaps the majority — has no "emotional identification" with the union and its goals. Many of them regard their union as a sort of slot machine in which you insert your monthly dues with the hope that something may come out.

Most of the union members interviewed by the authors of this study were rather cynical about their officers' motives in seeking union leadership — cynical, too, about the financial integrity of their officers and critical of their competence. However, very few of those interviewed were willing to accept the onerous responsibility of union

leadership. They were perfectly willing to "let George do it."

More encouraging is the authors' conclusion that the average rank-and-filer has a guilty conscience about his failure to take a more active interest in union affairs. He still has a feeling of responsibility towards his local union. For the good of the labor movement and for the common good of the nation as a whole, it is highly important that this dormant sense of social responsibility be aroused and translated into action.

This will never happen, however, unless the rank-and-file members of the labor movement are imbued with the spirit of idealism which characterized that little group of dedicated men who met in convention in Columbus, Ohio in December, 1886, for the purpose of establishing the American Federation of Labor. Fortunately it is not necessary to strain our imagination to visualize the sacrifices which those early pioneers willingly made for the cause of organized labor in the years immediately following the original Columbus convention. Samuel Gompers tells the story of those years very simply but very movingly in his autobiography, which was completed shortly before his death in 1924. It is a thrilling story indeed and one which ought to be required reading for every new member of the labor movement.

The American labor movement has come a long way indeed since Gompers was elected first president of the American Federation of Labor in 1886. May it never forget where it has come from. If it does, it will inevitably lose sight of where it ought to be going.

Gompers and his pioneer associates in the establishment of the American Federation of Labor were not the only heroes of the labor movement. The men who parted company with the Federation in the middle 30's to establish the Congress of Industrial Organizations also made an important contribution to the cause. It is not our purpose nor our function to evaluate the reasons for the cleavage between the two organizations, but now that they are together again in the united labor movement, and in view of the

fact that we have already paid sincere tribute to the work of the AFL, it would seem appropriate to say a word about the significance of the CIO in the over-all development of the labor movement. Again it is a question of remembering where the present labor movement came from and where it is going.

In our opinion, the establishment of the CIO in the middle '30s was an important landmark in the history of the United States. It was truly a great step forward in the development of human progress — not only in the United States but, by force of example and moral influence, in other countries as well.

One way of measuring CIO's contribution to the cause of social justice and to the strengthening of American democracy is to compare the statistics on wages, hours and working conditions of millions of men and women in the mass production industries before and after 1935. The record speaks for itself, and it must be credited in large measure to the efforts of the CIO and its affiliates.

The phenomenal progress reflected in these statistics never would have been achieved in the absence of militant industrial unions. It is now generally agreed that the establishment of such unions would have been postponed, perhaps for many years, in the absence of the CIO.

In the final analysis, however, this remarkable improvement in the material standard of living of millions of industrial workers is less important than CIO's historic contribution, at what we might call the spiritual level, to the cause of human freedom and human brotherhood. We are not referring specifically to what the CIO has done, for example, to promote the cause of interracial justice. To be sure, that was a very important contribution to the strengthening of American democracy, but what we wish to emphasize in particular is the broader contribution made by the CIO to the cause of self-government in industry.

A well-known Catholic philosopher, Professor Yves Simon of Chicago University, makes this point very forcefully in a recent

book on *The Philosophy of Democratic Government*. "So long," he says, "as the labor union remains faithful to its idea and keeps itself from corruption by economic power, free from monopolistic practices, free from subservience to party ambition or state bureaucracy, it constitutes a unique means to train masses of men in self-government. . . . Over and above resistance to unfair management, labor organizations have accomplished the double feat of helping to establish discipline among masses of men and of giving such discipline the higher meaning of autonomy."

This is true of every labor union worthy of the name. But in recent years it would seem to have been particularly true of the mass production unions, most of which have been affiliated with the CIO. For the millions of semi-skilled or unskilled workers organized into these unions were the very people most in need of an effective means of achieving self-government in their working lives.

In the absence of strong unions, banded together in a strong federation, these workers would have been voteless citizens of the industrial community; victims, at worst, of industrial serfdom; or, at best, beneficiaries of a degrading type of paternalism. Instead of that, they are now able to stand on their own feet as mature citizens of a developing economic democracy which, in turn, is an indispensable bulwark or support of political democracy.

The CIO had its problems during the past two decades, notably the problem of Communist infiltration. Fortunately that problem was met head-on and, so far as the former CIO is concerned, no longer exists. There is still the problem of rank-and-file apathy in many former CIO locals and internationals, but this problem is not confined exclusively to the CIO. It is the everlasting problem of democracy — how to get free men voluntarily to assume responsibility, day in and day out, for their own economic and political welfare and for the common good of society as a whole.

To the extent that the AFL and the CIO can solve this problem in the unified labor

movement which, thanks be to God, is now a reality, they will put all of us even further in their debt. For, to repeat, a vigorous democratic labor movement — which means a labor movement in which there is active rank-and-file participation — is one of the strongest possible bulwarks of political democracy. For that reason, as Professor Simon has written, "any reform which would jeopardize the operation of labor unions or alter their essential constitution is bound to arouse the suspicion of the democratic mind."

This danger is always present but, in our opinion, it should not be exaggerated at the present time. All things considered, we would expect the unified labor movement, in cooperation with enlightened management, to make gradual but steady and substantial progress in the years ahead.

Parenthetically at this point it might be well to say a word about the current Senate investigation of labor racketeering. What effect will the investigation have on the labor movement over the long haul?

This question was answered succinctly as follows in a recent issue of a well known Washington newsletter: ". . . The union movement is about to have its worst setback in 20 years and it has it coming. But the movement is still chock-full of virility, and after pause and clean-up it will go ahead . . . on a new and wiser course."

In other words, the net effect of the Senate investigation will be good for the labor movement. We are inclined to agree with this conclusion. That is to say, we are fully confident that the labor movement will emerge from the present crisis not only cleaner but stronger and much more effective than ever before.

We say this principally because of the statesmanlike and intelligent manner in which the labor movement has reacted to the Senate investigation. The labor movement could have dug its own grave, so to speak, if it had opposed or refused to cooperate with the investigation. That would have been disastrous. Fortunately, however, George Meany and his associates on the Executive Council of the AFL-CIO are co-

operating fully with the staff of the McClellan committee.

These men readily admit that there are serious abuses in the labor movement, and when they say they are determined to eliminate these abuses, they mean it. Naturally they would prefer to clean house on their own initiative through the medium of their recently established Ethical Practices Committee. They realize, however, that the job is too big for them and consequently, as we have already indicated, they welcome the assistance of the McClellan Committee.

The top officials of the AFL-CIO, in addition to cooperating with the McClellan committee in the investigation of union abuses, have pledged themselves to support legislation designed to eliminate these abuses. There is no doubt in our mind that they fully intend to live up to this commitment, let the chips fall where they may. In other words, they are not merely sparring for time or talking for public consumption. They mean business.

The leaders of the AFL-CIO also deserve a great deal of credit for having enacted a detailed Code of Ethics which will be binding on all of their officers and affiliates under penalty of suspension or expulsion. In this respect, they have set an example which might well be followed by all of the other economic organizations in the United States — the National Association of Manufacturers, for example, and the U. S. Chamber of Commerce. But what's sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

In paying tribute to the statesmanship of the top officials of the AFL-CIO, we do not mean to gloss over or to make light of the problem of racketeering and corruption in the labor movement. The problem is admittedly a very serious one. Moreover it must be said, in all frankness, that the labor movement winked at the problem far too many years. Consequently if organized labor is on the spot at the present time, it has nobody to blame but itself.

The fact remains, however, that the responsible officials of the AFL-CIO are making up for lost time. However belatedly, they are now squarely facing up to their

responsibilities in the field of ethical practices. We have already suggested that they would be foolish to expect any medals for doing their simple duty. Nevertheless they do have a right to expect a certain degree of sympathetic understanding on the part of the Congress and the general public particularly in the field of labor legislation.

The public has every right to expect the AFL-CIO officials to support corrective legislation. But punitive legislation — i.e., legislation designed to weaken the labor movement or "to cut it down to size" — is no solution to the problem of racketeering or corruption. On the contrary, it would only make the problem worse.

I would say again that the labor movement is likely to make steady and substantial progress in the years ahead. Some people, of course, still have great fear or suspicion of unions. They are sufficiently numerous to be a continuing cause of concern to all those who are interested in the future of labor-management relations in the United States. Their attitude with regard to unions has already done considerable harm. It has resulted, for example, in the enactment of so-called right-to-work laws in seventeen or eighteen states. Fortunately, however, it is not the dominant point of view in the United States at the present time. The people who really count in American industry — as contrasted with some of the doctrinaires who now claim to be speaking for the business community — are too realistic and too honorable to want to go back to the bad old days of the '20s or the early '30s. They still have their differences with organized labor, but they are increasingly disposed to admit that unions are desirable and necessary.

This is not mere wishful thinking on our part, nor is it just an impression or a hunch. Rather it is based on solid evidence compiled by competent experts in the field of labor-management relations. Take the subject of union security as a case in point. The record, as compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor, clearly shows that unions have made widespread gains in obtaining union

security clauses in their collective bargaining contracts in recent years despite all the excitement and furor about right-to-work legislation. Indeed, the list of prominent corporations which have agreed to union security provisions in their collective bargaining contracts reads like the Blue Book or the Who's Who of American industry. Moreover many other prominent employers have agreed to union shop clauses that would become operative upon repeal of right-to-work laws in their respective states. Others have agreed to add a union security clause whenever it may legally be done or at least to re-open the contract for bargaining on the issue.

This doesn't mean that we have reached the millennium, but at least it would seem to indicate that management is mellowing in its attitude with regard to trade unionism and that the relationship between management and organized labor in the United States is more amicable than the official propaganda of both groups sometimes make it out to be. If time permitted, many other encouraging developments could be cited in support of this conclusion.

By the same token, organized labor is mellowing in its attitude with regard to management. In this connection, it is interesting as well as instructive to compare the preamble to the original constitution of the AFL, as officially adopted in Columbus in 1886, with that of the united labor movement, as adopted at the merger convention in New York City last December.

The 1886 preamble reads as follows:

"Whereas, A struggle is going on in all the nations of the civilized world between the oppressors and the oppressed of all countries, a struggle between the capitalist and the laborer, which grows in intensity from year to year, and will work disastrous results to the toiling millions if they are not combined for mutual protection and benefit. It, therefore, behooves the representatives of the Trade and Labor Unions of America, in convention assembled, to adopt such measures and disseminate such principles among the mechanics and laborers of our country as will permanently unite them to secure the recognition of rights to which they are justly entitled. We, therefore, declare ourselves in favor of the

formation of a thorough Federation, embracing every Trade and Labor Organization in America, organized under the Trade Union system."

The preamble to the completely revised constitution of the newly organized AFL-CIO is much more mellow and incidentally much more realistic. It reads in part as follows:

"We seek the fulfillment of (our) hopes and aspirations through democratic processes within the framework of our constitutional government and consistent with our institutions and traditions.

"At the collective bargaining table, in the community, in the exercise of the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, we shall responsibly serve the interests of all the American people.

"We shall combat resolutely the forces which seek to undermine the democratic institutions of our nation and to enslave the human soul. We shall strive always to win full respect for the dignity of the human individual whom our unions serve.

"With Divine guidance, grateful for the fine traditions of our past, confident of meeting the challenge of the future, we proclaim this constitution."

The obvious difference in tone between these two documents — which, of course, reflects the difference in economic and social conditions as between 1886 and 1956 — is a significant indication of the progress we have made in the field of labor-management cooperation during the past 70 years, the Biblical span of three score years and ten, a relatively short period of time by any reckoning. If we have not arrived at the millennium — and, of course, we never will — at least we can say that we are moving in the right direction. The philosophy of class conflict has no place in our thinking. The right of labor to organize and bargain collectively, which was almost universally denied, in practice if not in theory, in 1886, is today widely accepted, and is likely to be universally accepted within the next decade or two. The American labor movement, which, in its present form, was established in Columbus, Ohio in a dingy little auditorium in 1886 is now one of the most influential and highly respected institutions in

our national life. Newspaper reporters were rigidly excluded from the 1886 convention in Columbus on the valid grounds that the metropolitan press at that time was almost universally anti-labor in its sympathies. By contrast, the merger convention in December of 1955 was lavishly covered by the press and by radio and television with the enthusiastic cooperation of the convention staff. To cite another example of progress, Labor Day which was established by the labor movement on its own initiative 76 years ago, has long since become a legal holiday and is now officially observed in all the States and Territories of our beloved country and two years ago, for the first time, was the subject of a commemorative stamp issued by the Post Office Department as a national tribute to the labor movement. Moreover Labor Day, which was originally the property as it were, only of the workers, now belongs to all of our citizens, regardless of their occupation. Whereas its original purpose was to dramatize the legitimate grievances or complaints of organized labor against social and economic injustice, its purpose today is much more positive and constructive. It has become a sort of all-American semi-religious national holiday on which labor and management jointly re-dedicate themselves in a spirit of prayer to the great cause of social justice.

We have come a long way indeed since 1886 in the field of labor-management relations. To be sure, we still have a long way to go, but, all things considered, the outlook for the future is fairly bright and optimistic. We are entering a period which a prominent labor leader recently characterized as the era of preventive unionism. "A few years ago," he said, "people thought of a union as entirely a matter of clearing up poor working conditions — winning strikes and battles for higher pay and better worker treatment. Today this concept of trade unionism has expanded to see the union as a force for maintaining good conditions and preventing trouble, looking ahead to meet future problems and creating the climate of labor-management partnership in which frequent work stoppages become unnecessary."

"Preventive unionism," he concluded, "is something more than putting on boxing gloves for a periodic slugging match with a belligerent adversary. Preventive unionism establishes the avenues of communication, the frank discussion of all problems, resulting in higher pay and better working conditions. Recognition that the long-range interests of both labor and management depend on the successful operation of the enterprise has opened ways in which the union serves its own members, workers generally, and the nation."

Preventive unionism is admittedly a good thing as far as it goes, but it doesn't go far enough. It stops at the level of the individual enterprise or company. What we need in addition to preventive unionism is an organized system of labor-management co-operation at the industry-wide as well as the national level to anticipate and to solve, in cooperation with the government if necessary, the larger economic problems which transcend the limits of the individual enterprise or company and to a certain extent at least are beyond their immediate control. The problem of mass unemployment arising out of automation or technological improvements is a case in point. Incidentally an official representative of the Holy See, speaking on behalf of the Holy Father Himself, has reminded us that "The risk of mass unemployment as a result of the sudden modernization of factories is not illusory. In the face of this danger Catholic doctrine reminds us," he says, "that the economic progress of a country can be fully realized only by the free collaboration of wills . . ." and that "a judicious participation of workers in the effort of expansion can bring about a progressive and profound transformation of the present condition of the working class."

It stands to reason, of course, that labor and management will never be able to solve this kind of problem or to fulfill their proper role in society unless the individual men and women who belong to unions and employers associations are convinced that they have a moral obligation, in justice and charity, to assume their full share of respon-

sibility for the policies of these organizations. As the bishops of Australia pointed out in their celebrated Social Justice Statement of 1950, no man may trade his conscience to a political party, or a labor union, or an employers' association, or indeed to any other secular organization. Rather, "It is upon the moral conduct of men and women, in relation to these organized bodies that the well being or the suffering of mankind largely depends."

Our Holy Father reminded us recently that spiritual retreats are one of the most important means of developing this sense of social responsibility in the ranks of management and labor.

It was a happy coincidence that the Holy Father's letter on this subject should have been written at a time when, all over the world, Catholics were commemorating the Silver Jubilee of Pope Pius XI's encyclical, "On Reconstructing the Social Order." It serves to remind us that workers' retreats were also highly recommended in the latter document as a "most valuable means of both personal and social restoration."

This is a salutary reminder, for, in our reading of the social encyclicals, we are naturally tempted to concentrate almost exclusively on their specific proposals for economic and social reform, to the neglect of those passages which emphasize the necessity of training deeply spiritual apostolic lay leaders for the purpose of effecting these reforms.

Specialized retreats — for employers and professional men as well as for workers — are not the only means of developing such leaders, but surely they are one of the most important. In the words of the encyclical, *Quadragesimo Anno*, they are a "school of the spirit" in which "not only are the best of Christians developed but true apostles also are trained for every condition of life and are enkindled with the fire of the heart of Christ."

In addition to (and preferably, in conjunction with) this work of spiritual formation there must be a systematic program of education for workers and employers in the fundamentals of Christian social teaching.

Catholic projects along this line are fairly numerous in the United States, although obviously much remains to be done.

Schools primarily for employers, employees, or for both, are conducted under varying auspices. Among these are Catholic colleges, diocesan organizations, parishes and various lay groups. Such schools are called by different names: Institute of Industrial Relations, School of Social Action, Labor Schools, etc. The name does not always indicate who make up the student body. Labor's attendance has been proportionately greater than management's. Some schools are devoted to labor work with the rank and file, others concentrate on potential leaders. Priests are nearly always directors of these schools, or chaplain-advisors. They usually confine their teaching to industrial ethics and other aspects of morality. Qualified laymen, generally without pay, teach the other subjects, such as public speaking, parliamentary law, economics, history of the social movement, mediation, and social legislation. Classes are regularly held once a week. Tuition fees are nominal.

Workers' Schools date back to 1911, when Rev. Terence Shealy, S.J., founded at Xavier College, New York, a school of social studies which was later transferred to Fordham University and became affiliated with its School of Sociology and Social Service. In the early 30's St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia, inaugurated a series of courses for Catholic workingmen. The Xavier Labor School, one of the largest, opened in 1936. The Association of Catholic Trade Unionists started three schools in metropolitan New York in 1937; on Jan. 4 of the following year the Crown Heights School of Catholic Workmen opened in Brooklyn.

About half of the schools in this country are conducted by the Jesuits; the remainder are sponsored by such organizations as the ACTU, the Holy Name Society, the Knights of Columbus, the Young Christian Workers, the Catholic Labor Guild of Boston, etc. Many schools are under diocesan auspices; some are sponsored by individual parishes.

The foregoing summary of the Catholic labor school movement does not give a

complete picture of what is being done for workers and employers under Catholic auspices in the field of social education, but perhaps it will suffice for present purposes. For additional information on this and related subjects, the interested reader may contact the author of this article, care of Social Action Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C.

The need for apostles in the field of labor-management relations can hardly be exaggerated. Most of our employers and most of our labor leaders still believe in God and still have a sense of sin; they still recognize, more or less clearly, that they are bound by the moral law of God. I think it would be fair to say, however, that not enough of them are sufficiently concerned about their responsibilities to the community as a whole. Many of them are men of prayer, but not enough of them, I should think, have learned to pray as Solomon did at the Altar of Gabaon. The Scriptures tell us that the Lord appeared to Solomon in a dream and told him to choose whatever gift he wanted. And Solomon answered: "Lord God, thou hast bidden this servant of thine reign where his father reigned; but, Lord, what am I? No better than a little child, that has no skill to find its way back and forth. And here am I, thy servant, lost among the thousands of the people thou hast chosen, a people whose numbers are beyond all count and reckoning. Be this, then, thy gift to thy servant, a heart quick to learn, so that I may be able to judge thy people's disputes and discern between good

and ill. How else should a man sit in judgement over such a people as this, great as thy people is great?"

We can think of no more appropriate prayer to recommend to the rank-and-file and particularly to the leaders of labor and management. Solomon was a king, but his power and his influence were no greater than that of the modern labor leader and the modern employer who are called to sit in judgement every day over the economic destinies of thousands and sometimes millions of people. They, too, must feel at times that they are "no better than a little child, that has no skill to find its way back and forth." They, too, have need, above everything else, of "a heart quick to learn" so that they may be able to judge their people's disputes. If they will ask the good Lord for this gift with the humility of a Solomon, they may expect to receive the same reply. They, too, may expect to hear the Lord say, as He said to Solomon: "For this request of thine . . . thou shalt be rewarded. Thou didst not ask for a long life, or riches, or vengeance upon thy enemies, but for wisdom to administer justice. Thy prayer is granted; hereby I grant thee a heart full of wisdom and discernment beyond all that went before thee or shall come after thee." May this priceless favor, "the wisdom to administer justice," be granted to all of us, but especially to the responsible leaders of labor and management, through the intercession of good St. Joseph who is officially honored by the Universal Church as the heavenly patron of the workingman.

The Work of Religion and Labor Liaison

Clair M. Cook

Executive Director, Religion and Labor Foundation, Columbus 14, Ohio

"CHURCHES AND unions," writes Joseph Mire in *Labor Education*, "are both institutions which can play a very crucial role in the realization of a fair and democratic society, free from religious, racial and economic exploitation. The churches are increasingly concerned with such economic and social problems as the implication of nuclear developments, racial policies, industrial relations and other non-ecclesiastical questions. The recent trend to the employment of 'plant chaplains' has put the need for a sound and better understanding of labor-church relations into further focus. Unions, on the other hand, appreciate the need of basing their social and economic policies on ethical and moral principles. Few formal relationships have been established thus far between the churches and labor, and much exploration needs to be done, to discover a fruitful pattern for joint educational programs or activities."

With those words, a study report on needs, programs and approaches to labor education prepared for the Fund for Adult Education recognizes from the labor side the need for inter-group education between religion and labor. The two-way process envisioned by the Inter-University Labor Education Committee (now succeeded by the National Institute for Labor Education) might be called religious education within the labor movement and, at the same time, economic education among churchmen.

Those two educational facets of the Religion and Labor Foundation are specifically envisioned in the charter it secured in 1956 from the Regents of the University of the State of New York as an educational corporation. Previously a membership corporation, the RLF was originally formed in 1931 with the purpose of enlisting church

sympathy and support for the hard-pressed labor movement of the pre-Wagner Act era. But the conditions of the 1930's and '40's are outmoded by the 1950's, and a changed orientation from partisanship to a two-way educational emphasis seemed indicated by the mid-'50's. Labor has grown to a place in the American community where its primary need from a liaison organization linking it to religious forces is no longer the enlistment of direct or uncritical support.

Clergymen and theological students on the picket lines of twenty years ago gave a lift to men who were battling for basic social justice in an economy where a twenty-five-cent hourly minimum wage was a big forward step. As a theological student in 1934, I was one of those picket-line sympathizers in a shoe workers' strike against a shop where men with families were earning twelve to fourteen dollars a week, and women as low as six dollars. The strike was then the common weapon for securing organized bargaining rights, and the Religion and Labor Foundation as a membership corporation encouraged direct participating support of churchmen and theological students on behalf of the labor movement.

The growth of labor's economic power has eliminated the need for such efforts today, but it has not done away with the necessity for concern. Because of labor's new-found position in the economy, it is more than ever vital for religious leadership to understand labor-management relations, to bring the undergirding of ethical and religious values to labor's leaders, and to develop a closer working relationship in those areas of common effort for the social good—the "non-ecclesiastical questions"—to which Mr. Mire refers.

That the churches are aware of their re-

sponsibilities is attested by the growth of official denominational social action to include an increasing emphasis on economic and labor-management affairs. This is reflected, for example, in the title adopted for the official Methodist agency authorized by the 1952 General Conference, the Board of Social and Economic Relations, which has just added to its staff an associate director with particular concern for the economic area, and which is cooperating with six other agencies of the denomination in a national industrial relations conference at Cincinnati October 30 to November 2, 1958.

The work of the Department of the Church and Economic Life in the National Council of Churches; of Msgr. George G. Higgins in the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference; of Dr. Theodore Pretzlaff as director of the church and economic life department of the American Lutheran Church; of Rabbi Eugene Lipman for the Union of American Hebrew Congregations; of Dean Marshal L. Scott in the Presbyterian Institute of Industrial Relations — these are further indications of a rising religious interest in responsible economic life, particularly apparent since the end of World War II.

At the same time, there are indications that the labor movement, and to some extent management, is looking to the church increasingly for counsel in a more mature manner. Establishment of Rev. Charles C. Webber's post of Representative for Religious Relations in the AFL-CIO; the selection of three religious leaders — Father Cronin, Rabbi Lipman and Rev. Cameron P. Hall — as a panel to work toward any possible solution of the Kohler strike; inclusion on the UAW Public Review Board of Rabbi Morris Adler, Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, and Msgr. Higgins; the calling of a ten-member clergy committee to advise American Motors on the ethical aspects of its current collective bargaining, and their subsequent consultations with the UAW for the same purpose; the invitation of the AFL-CIO merger convention to Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, Rabbi Israel Goldstein and

Fr. Raymond A. McGowan for platform addresses in addition to the usual invocations — these are among indications of a growing recognition by labor of religion's concern for its affairs, and of the desire to keep in touch with moral leadership in an advisory capacity.

The old antipathies to religion, so pronounced in the Socialist orientation common to labor leaders, a half-century ago, have largely disappeared. In the 1890's, a convention resolution of the AFL specifically barred attendance or addresses by clergymen; now they are welcomed as observers, introduced to the convention, and frequently local pulpit engagements are filled by leading labor officers during the convention week-end. President Meany has been honored by the Laetare Medal of Notre Dame as an outstanding Catholic layman; Walter Reuther has received an honorary degree from Boston University in a special convocation under its Graduate School of Theology; and a study by Dean Liston Pope a few years ago revealed that 90 per cent of the 200 top officers of the then AFL and CIO were church members.

Yet, it should be said that these and other indications of rapprochement to bridge a gap existing between organized religion and organized labor for a century and a half, are only a beginning toward the awareness of cooperative possibilities between the two. The labor leader who is more than a nominal churchman is still all too rare although, at nearly every labor convention I attend, delegates stopping by the Religion and Labor Foundation display tell me of their activities as Sunday School teacher, deacon, official board or building committee member in a local church. But too frequently, with a touch of inferiority feelings in a parish of predominantly business and professional people, active unionists and officers fail to reveal to their church associates or pastor their activity in the union. Part of the responsibility for failure in linking religion and labor in life and action lies with union members.

But fully as great is the failure of clergymen of all groups in parish work to under-

stand or be concerned with economic and labor-management realities. How many of them have even seen a good labor paper, such as the weekly AFL-CIO News, let alone subscribe to one? Yet I have no doubt that a request by any clergyman to be placed on the mailing list of any of the nine hundred or so labor papers in the country would be honored gladly without charge.

The charter of the Religion and Labor Foundation — which, as a perennially penurious organization without endowment should probably never have been given the pretentious "Foundation" label — authorizes it "to conduct a program of inter-group education between organized religion of all faiths and the various organizations of labor; to encourage studies aimed at exploring and developing the areas of common social concern and to promote mutual understanding; to issue a regular publication devoted to reporting on studies of religion-labor cooperation; to establish fellowship groups for regular meeting of individuals from the fields of religion and labor in various localities; to study methods of improving cooperation and mutual understanding of labor and economic questions within theological training schools; to make ethical principles relevant to our entire industrial life; to hold conferences, conduct special studies and research, publish findings, and in other suitable ways bring religious and labor leaders into closer understanding and mutual harmony."

Either individuals or groups (such as a church or union, men's club, women's society) may become members, and receive the monthly publication *Religion and Labor*. But the chief educational techniques of the Religion and Labor Foundation are based on the belief that there is no substitute for direct personal acquaintance between churchmen and labor leaders. That is why the local Religion and Labor Council, whether chartered or unaffiliated, is of such proven vitality. With the recent addition of a Field Director, the Rev. Alex Dandar of the Congregational Church, these should increase in numbers and value.

Take a look at the Columbus, Ohio,

group as an example, the oldest continuing local Religion and Labor community-wide fellowship, which began in 1942. A steering committee of local labor leaders and clergymen plans the monthly luncheon meetings, frequently held at the YWCA, where cafeteria service is coupled with an available private room for a monthly "Dutch treat" session, planned for adjournment by 1:30 or earlier. On a recent occasion, Msgr. Kappas of the diocesan Catholic Charities Bureau and Harry Mayfield, president of the city CIO council, spoke on the local welfare problems in this period of unemployment and growing need. A couple of years ago the group, with thirty or so usually attending although with much fluctuation of personnel from one month to another, met alternately in church and labor settings. The meal served in a synagogue hall was kosher, and the young assistant to the rabbi spoke on the history of the predominantly Jewish needle trades unions. At a meeting in Carpenter's Hall, the business agent for the International Typographical Union and the editor of a local daily discussed "How We Solve Our Problems." In a Protestant church, the meal was followed by explanations of the current strike at Westinghouse. A priest, at a meeting in his parish hall, considered "Workers in Our Parish."

A by-product of the Columbus group's increase in understanding of labor relations has been occasional fact-finding duty by clergymen from their number in strike situations. When the Mayor set up such a citizens' committee in the Westinghouse strike, three of the four clergymen on it were active members of the group. Because they had performed a less official service a year and a half earlier in a 500-member strike of a steel local to help get long-stalled negotiations off dead center, they knew how to proceed and what to look for. Their report was consequently much more prompt and discerning than it could have been without this background.

Similar groups in Detroit, Dallas, Little Rock, Los Angeles, Cincinnati and elsewhere around the country have been fre-

quently the only place where leaders from both factions of the divided labor movement got together. Also, as the rabbi chairman of the Fargo, North Dakota, chapter observed, this may likewise be the only place in town where clergy of the three faiths find common meeting ground.

It is not the Religion and Labor Foundation's intention to discuss housing, race relations in industry, collective bargaining problems, and other matters for the sake of doing something about them as a group. But the stimulus of discussion, the follow-up by concerned people returning to their own primary groups, may be the means of animating those who can follow through. In Fargo, for instance, a discussion on housing aroused a concern which resulted eventually in establishing a municipal committee for local action. In Little Rock, the RLF was the first group to hold unsegregated meetings in a downtown hotel several years ago.

This educational technique based on personal fellowship could be adapted to many more local situations. To be put into practice, it does not require the coming of any outside "organizer" or field man, only a desire by local religious and labor leaders for a closer understanding. In Fresno, California the central labor body invited — by personal invitation of individual members to their pastors as well as by mail — clergymen to meet with labor leaders for a breakfast, the labor group footing the bill. Success resulted in continuation, with a steering committee, secretary, and a schedule of further meetings. Detroit has sometimes had luncheon meetings, sometimes dinner; Canton, Ohio, has experimented with an evening forum type of approach without a meal. Los Angeles maintains co-chairmen for religion and for labor, with quite sizable meetings, an executive board, a budget, and a letter head.

A second educational technique of the Religion and Labor Foundation, aimed at seminary students, is based on the same principle of serving as the liaison agency for bringing people from the two realms into personal contact. For a number of

years the RLF has brought theological students to major labor conventions, such as that of the AFL-CIO last December at Atlantic City, when fifteen seminaries were represented. Observing the convention in action, holding their own sessions with church leaders and guest speakers, the students find the experience one of lasting impressions. Wrote one of them recently: "My stereotypes of labor union officials were challenged in both directions. Some of the leaders were finer and more clear-thinking men than I had supposed — especially the Reuther brothers — and some were more benighted than I had expected . . . The highlight of the conference for me was Victor Reuther's address and question-answer session in the meeting following the luncheon. I have had few exposures to labor's needs before, but Mr. Reuther really laid a claim on my life to do something to bring the church's resources and benefits to laboring people. I found a new area of concern for my ministry."

Such an experience need not be confined to seminarians and great international labor conventions. In every area there are AFL and CIO councils, increasingly merging into united AFL-CIO central labor bodies whose delegates are drawn from the constituent unions of all sorts in the community. They would welcome a visit of observation and acquaintance to one of their meetings by clergymen as individuals or as groups. Further, district and state conferences and conventions of various labor groups, labor education institutes, and a wide variety of occasions offer additional opportunities in most cities for the same kind of first-hand acquaintance with the labor movement in action. Labor people generally are most receptive to approaches by religious leaders seeking such occasions for observation and knowledge.

This kind of education — self-education, perhaps — can be religious education for adult churchmen as surely as a seminar in race relations is education for Christian social action. And only as we develop a religious leadership knowledgeable in terms of labor's realities, understanding such things

as the internal political nature of democratic unionism, can we approach closely enough to serve the labor movement's needs as we ought. Ethical and religious values cannot be applied in a vacuum; they are sustained in daily life only in the context of the problems to which they must be applied. It is all very well to decry corruption in the leadership of a few segments of American labor, but will those who seek its eradication turn to the churches and their leaders for help? Not so long as they meet with lack of understanding, or worse yet, distorted misunderstanding gleaned at second hand from often biased sources.

Labor's trying hour of self-examination, when it has taken courageous steps to de-

velop codes of ethics unmatched elsewhere in the economy, has not found very many informed and sympathetic churchmen giving the kind of help one might expect of the titular leaders of righteousness. We need to know, to understand, to develop churchmen specialists who can serve as liaison between the pulpit and the wide world beyond the church's doors. As the 1937 encyclical of Pope Pius XI on "Atheistic Communism" phrased it in advice to priests, "Go to the workingman." The experience will be rewarding both to religious leaders and to labor leaders alike, a two-way process of economic and religious education.

RELIGION IN CURRENT MAGAZINES (Concluded)

Television: J. C. Wynn has some critical comments on "The Dwindling Audience for Religious TV," in *Presbyterian Life*, May 3, '58. Those responsible for church programs could well profit from reading this short article.

• • • •

Mother of Methodism: Herman B. Teeter tells the story of Susanna Wesley, "Mother of Methodism," in *Together*, April, '58.

• • • •

Sidney Hook: If you are interested in the pro's and con's of free will, and who isn't, you will not miss Sidney Hook's article, "Moral Freedom in a Determined World — Responsibility and Sentimentalism," in *Commentary*, May, '58.

• • • •

More on church-state: John C. Slemp writes on "What the State Cannot Do and What the Church Must Do," in *The Churchman*, May, '58.

• • • •

Church architecture: "But Is It a Church?" asks Eugene Raskin in *The Nation*, May 10, '58.

• • • •

Children's books: new lists of good books for children are published in *The New York Times Book Review*, May 18, '58, and in *The Commonwealth*, May 23, '58.

• • • •

Church-related colleges: What's Ahead for our 744 Church-Related Colleges?, asks Benjamin Fine in *Christian Herald*, June, '58.

• • • •

Judaism: The controversial issue of strengthening Jewish consciousness in Israel through the school system is discussed by Dr. Noah Nardi in *The Jewish Digest*, May, '58. Title: "Israel's Schools Teach Judaism."

• • • •

Mr. Lutheran: The June '58 issue of *Coronet* features an article about the Rev. Dr. Franklin Clark Fry, president of the Lutheran World Federation, the first American to head this organization. The article, "Mr. Lutheran," is by William Peters.

The Church at Work

IN THE FIELD OF LABOR RELATIONS

Charles C. Webber

AFL-CIO Representative For Religious Relations

EVER since Jesus, the Carpenter of Nazareth, told the Parable of the Last Judgment he has been an inspiration to many of his followers in their endeavors to aid working men and women to organize and to "feed the hungry, cloth the naked and visit the sick."

In medieval times, the officials of the Catholic Church appointed chaplains to the guilds, forerunners of our modern trade unions.

John Wesley, the Anglican clergyman founder of Methodism, "supported a living wage and honest healthy employment for all." His English Methodist preachers, according to Jack Lawson, a member of the British House of Parliament, were among "the first fighters and speakers for unions, Cooperative Societies, political freedom and improved conditions."

Three of the "Tolpuddle Martyrs" of the English Trade Union Movement in the early 1830's, according to Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, were Methodist "local preachers." They were sent as prisoners to Australia simply because they dared to organize a union of "farm hands," and in the process had administered a "secret oath."

Thirty thousand London organized workers marched in protest of their imprisonment on April 21, 1834, bearing thirty-three trade banners and a petition for their release with over a quarter of a million signatures. And at the head of the procession rode the "chaplain to the Metropolitan Trade Unions, Reverend Dr. Arthur Wade, wearing the scarlet hood of a Doctor of Divinity."

The Catholic Church and Organized Labor

"During the middle of the 19th century," according to John Brophy, one of the pres-

ent day outstanding trade union leaders in the United States, "Roman Catholic Bishop Von Ketteler of Germany declaimed against unfair treatment of the workingmen and their families. He urged the workers to organize for social reform and was a pioneer in this field. His work influenced social legislation in Germany and the building up of voluntary self-help associations among the workers."

"In Britain, Cardinal Manning, during the great London dock strike in 1888, threw his influence and support to the striking dock workers. . . . He loaned his prestige to the effort to find a basis of settlement. A public conciliation committee was set up to work with the strike leaders and the directors of the dock corporations, and after five weeks of strike the directors, through the effort of Cardinal Manning and his committee, granted all the workers' demands."

In the United States, Cardinal Gibbons of Baltimore, "the most influential man in the American hierarchy" in the 1880's, conferred with the Grand Master Workman of the Knights of Labor, Terence V. Powderly, and then went to Rome where with the support of England's Cardinal Manning he pleaded the cause of the Knights at the Vatican and won his case. Whereupon, as a Catholic trade unionist puts it, "Pope Leo XIII found no objection to the U. S. Knights of Labor."

In 1891, Pope Leo XIII undoubtedly influenced by Bishop Von Ketteler and Cardinals Manning and Gibbons, issued *Rerum Novarum* — his justly famous social encyclical on the condition of labor.

In it, as John Brophy states, "the Pope declared for a program of social reform (not simply individual reform), with State

intervention to protect the worker against the abuses of capital; the right of the worker to organize and the doctrine of the worker's right to a living wage as a minimum."

Rerum Novarum and Pope Pius XI's encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*, "On Reconstructing the Social Order," issued forty years later in 1931, enable American trade unionists, Protestant as well as Catholic, to feel that there is a solid religious and moral foundation under the right of the workers to organize and bargain collectively with their employers in regard to wages, hours and working conditions.

These encyclicals and the work of Father John Joseph Curran of Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, during the great coal strike of 1902, and in recent years to mention the work of only a few Catholic clergymen such as Msgr. John Ryan, Fr. Raymond A. McGowan and Fr. John Cronin and Msgr. George G. Higgins of the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, make it possible for working-men and women of all "faiths" and of no "faith" to know that religious leaders have and are taking positive stands for economic justice and social righteousness.

The Presbyterian Church and Organized Labor

Professor Philip Taft of Brown University in his *AF of L in the Time of Gompers* points out in his Chapter on "The Churches and Organized Labor" that "the Presbyterian Church was the first Christian denomination to show a formal interest in the labor problem."

"A Department of Church and Labor was authorized and in 1905, Reverend Charles Stelzle, an ordained minister and a member of the International Association of Machinists, who had been placed in charge of the Department, was allowed to address the AF of L Convention."

"He was able to declare that the Department of Church and Labor 'is the only official organization of the kind in the world.'"

"He pleaded for better understanding between the church and organized labor, and described the evils he knew at first hand,

and his anxiety to promote cooperation between the two institutions for their abolition."

"Subsequently, a resolution was adopted (by the AF of L) recommending to all affiliated city and state branches that, whenever practicable, they exchange fraternal delegates with the various city and state ministerial associations."

In 1906, 1907, and 1908, Charles Stelzle, then head of the Presbyterian Labor Temple in New York City, was seated as a fraternal delegate from the Department of Church and Labor of the Presbyterian Church to the AF of L Convention by a vote of the Executive Council of that organization.

His addresses to the Convention made a profound impression upon the delegates and visitors and undoubtedly played a significant role in getting the American Federation of Labor later to request the Federal Council of Churches to recommend to the churches of America that the Sunday before Labor Day, or another as near thereto as possible, be observed as Labor Sunday with appropriate sermons and exercises.

The Federal Council issued its first Labor Sunday Message in 1917 and this was continued annually throughout the Council's existence to 1951. Since that date, the Message has been issued by the successor National Council of Churches.

The Methodists and Organized Labor

On December 3, 1907, at a national conference of socially-minded Methodists in Washington, D. C., the unofficial Methodist Federation for Social Service was born.

Under the leadership of such men as Frank Mason North, the author of "Where Cross the Crowded Ways of Life," Dr. Worth M. Tippy, then pastor of Epworth Church, Cleveland, Ohio, and Rev. Harry F. Ward, then serving the "Stockyards Church" in Chicago, the group drew up a document relating the Christian faith to such problems as child labor, low wages, exploitation of women in industry, industrial accidents, disease and unemployment.

The following year, 1908, the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal

Church formally adopted the statement prepared by the Methodist Federation for Social Service and ordered it printed in the Discipline under the title of the Social Creed of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

In 1912, the newly organized Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America took this Methodist Social Creed and expanded it into a statement of Social Ideals for nearly all of the American Protestant churches.

"From the beginning," as Alson J. Smith writes in his *Story of the Methodist Federation for Social Service*, "the Federation sought to interpret Labor to the Church — The Eight Hour Day, the Living Wage, Collective Bargaining, and other 'radical' demands by labor were accepted by the Federation and interpreted to the church in a day when their espousal brought harsh criticism."

"In the first year of its existence (the Federation) attempted to mediate a dispute between the Typographical Union and one of the branches of the Methodist Book Concern."

In consequence of such actions by the members of the MFSS under the leadership of Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Dr. Harry F. Ward, and Bishops L. O. Hartman, James Baker, and G. Bromley Oxnam, the Federation was highly regarded for many years by nationally known labor leaders as one of the principal forces in the United States working for industrial democracy.

The Baptists and Organized Labor

Walter Rauschenbusch, who served for eleven years as the pastor of the Second German Baptist Church on the edge of Hell's Kitchen in New York City and thereby gained the experiences that made him, not only the Baptists' but also Protestantism's prophet of the social gospel, was forthright in his defense of the aspirations and aims of the labor unions.

In his *Christianizing The Social Order*, published in 1912, he asserted, "When the unions demand a fixed minimum wage, a maximum working day, and certain reasonable conditions of labor as a security for health, safety, and continued efficiency, they

are standing for human life against profits. . . .

"They are standing for the growth of democracy, for earned against unearned income, for the protection of human weakness against the pressure of profit, for the right of recreation, education, and love, and for the solidarity of the workers. . . . The seed of a new social order is in them. They too belong to 'the powers of the coming age.'"

Such assertions as these endeared Walter Rauschenbusch to thousands of trade union members and he helped many to achieve a living faith in a God of love and justice.

A Disciple of Walter Rauschenbusch

Inspired by Walter Rauschenbusch and his *Christianizing the Social Order* and by Borden P. Bowne's *Studies in Christianity* in my under-graduate years at the University of Michigan, I furthered my preparation for a ministry to working men and women at Boston University School of Theology and at Union Theological Seminary in New York City.

The Ford Hall Lectures in 1915 by Harry F. Ward, Boston University Professor of Christian Ethics, on "The Labor Movement from the Standpoint of Religious Values," and the recognition by the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America at that time of the right of employees and employers alike to organize, confirmed me in my desire to serve in the church in the field of labor relations.

For more than 40 years now, I have endeavored to follow this course, and my experiences have been many and varied.

In retrospect, I recall that my first church was in a working-class section of Denver, Colorado. There, in 1921, in cooperation with my wife and other religious and labor leaders, we organized the Denver Labor College. It was housed in the Grace Community Church, and in the twenty years of its existence made it possible for hundreds of trade union men and women, not only to study trade union problems and the consumer cooperative movement, but also to apply their knowledge and to equip themselves to become first-class voting citizens.

In the mid-twenties, while serving in the coal fields of Pennsylvania and as the pastor of the Church of All Nations in New York City, my wife and I aided the United Mine Workers of America, the International Ladies Garment Workers of America, and the Paper Box Workers' Union in their strikes and in their educational programs. An article in the *Federal Council of Churches Bulletin* for March of 1927 quotes a labor leader as saying, "the efforts of the religious forces in New York City in regard to the paper-box makers' strike were better than a thousand sermons."

While on the faculty of Union Theological Seminary in New York City during the great Depression of the early 1930's, it was my privilege to help organize hundreds of unemployed workers in Paterson, New Jersey, — went with them when they appealed to the Governor of their state for increased relief — and worked with them on a "self-help" project.

During that same period, serving as a representative of the American Civil Liberties Union in strike situations in New York, New Jersey, Vermont, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky, I was greatly encouraged by the Federal Council of Churches' declaration in 1932 that it stood for "the right of employees and employers alike to organize for collective bargaining and social action; protection of both in the exercise of this right, and the obligation of both to work for the public good."

In the 1940's, while serving as an organizer for the Amalgamated Clothing Worker's of America, with the approval of Bishop Francis J. McConnell, and as a "Chaplain to Organized Labor," with the approval of Bishop Oxnam, I believe I was able to bring to unorganized Negro and white workers in the South a feeling that there was a moral and a religious sanction back of their efforts to organize.

This was possible because in 1940 the Federal Council of Churches recorded "its conviction that not only has labor a right to organize but also that it is socially desirable that it do so because of the need for col-

lective action in the maintenance of standards of living."

These experiences, of course, are but a few throughout the course of my ministry. Other church leaders in the field of labor relations, such as John Ramsay of the United Presbyterian Church, Victor Reuther of the Methodist Church, John Brophy and Harry Read of the Catholic Church, David Burgess of the United Church of Christ, and Clair Cook of the Religion and Labor Foundation, had equally significant experiences. My work and theirs led the National CIO in 1954 to set up a Religion and Labor Committee to further the development of a community interest between labor and religious organizations.

The AFL-CIO Office for Religious Relations

The AFL-CIO, after the Merger in 1955, feeling that it was exceedingly important that the forces of religion and labor should endeavor to understand one another and work for greater material, cultural, and spiritual fulfillment for everyone, then set up an Office for Religious Relations and appointed me as the AFL-CIO Representative for Religious Relations.

Our Office for Religious Relations, therefore, seeks to interpret our labor movement, its ideals, aims, practices, and achievements to the members and leaders of the various religious bodies in our country, and to provide a channel of communication, friendship and cooperation between religious and labor groups.

As AFL-CIO Representative for Religious Relations, in addressing over 150 international, national, regional, state, county and city church and synagogue meetings in 18 states during the past two and a half years, I have pointed out that the labor movement has real religious significance in that through its organizational efforts and collective bargaining it has won the higher wages and the shorter hours that give the workers the time and money for cultural, community, educational, and religious pursuits.

By describing our AFL-CIO efforts to

eliminate racketeering from the labor movement, we have endeavored to acquaint the members of religious organizations with the facts regarding the establishment of our Ethical Practices Committee, the formation of our Ethical Practices Codes and the suspension and expulsion of those individuals and unions who have been found guilty of violating the codes.

In presenting the case against the so-called state "Right-to-Work" laws, we have called the attention of both religious and labor groups to the statement adopted by the Division of Christian Life and Work of the National Council of Churches that:

"Union membership as a basis of continued employment should be neither required nor forbidden by law: the decision should be left to agreement by management and labor through the process of collective bargaining."

In March of this year, 1958, we mailed to our constituency a historic statement of the General Board of the National Council of Churches on the "Basic Principles Relating to Collective Bargaining," a declaration adopted February 28, 1958, setting forth for the first time by the National Council of Churches that "We recognize the right of both employers and employees to organize for collective bargaining, and in connection with employees we believe that it is generally desirable to do so." This statement also enumerated basic requirements which the members of the Board believe should be considered in all transactions between labor and management.

We are now planning on sending out the June 4, 1958, statement of the General Board of the National Council of Churches on "Christian Concern About Unemployment," which reaffirms its position of 1954 that "large-scale unemployment or long-continued unemployment for any considerable number of persons able and willing to work is intolerable." This statement also

"calls upon churches and church people to become informed of the human consequences of unemployment in their own localities; to give careful consideration to what can be done by public and private bodies, including the churches, to meet the material and spiritual needs of workers out of work and their families; and to participate actively, as citizens, in community, state, and national programs (including the retraining of workers) which will put workers back to work."

Our Office for Religious Relations also calls attention to proclamations by the principal religious organizations in our country — Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish — that deal with the church and synagogue at work in the field of labor relations and economic issues.

For example, last August, 1957, President Meany of the AFL-CIO, on our recommendation, sent to all of the AFL-CIO International Unions, State and City Central Labor Unions and Industrial Union Councils, the annual Labor Day and Labor Sunday Messages of the National Council of Churches, the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and of the Synagogue Council of America. These messages recognize and pay high tribute to the outstanding contribution organized labor has made and is making to our American society and economic order. Many of our labor organizations upon receiving such statements print the Messages in their papers and purchase additional copies to be distributed among their members.

In January of this year, 1958, we sent out statements by Monsignor George Higgins, Director, Social Action Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference, and Rabbi Eugene Lipman, Director, Commission on Synagogue Activities, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, giving their reactions to the 1957 Convention of the AFL-CIO.

The Protestant Parish Minister's Integrating Roles¹

Samuel W. Blizzard²

Professor of Christianity and Society, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey

I

THREE is much confusion in contemporary usage about the role of the Protestant parish minister. In part the lack of clarity is related to the use of similar nomenclature to describe the clergyman and his professional behavior. The purpose of this paper is to ferret out the various usages and connotations and to develop a system of analysis to distinguish between them. Three types of roles are identified here: the master role, the integrative role(s), and the practitioner roles.³

The minister plays many professional roles. The clergyman *qua* clergyman plays a master role (to be discussed in detail in another article) that distinguishes him from those in other professions (lawyers, physicians, social workers) and occupations (policemen, salesmen, plumbers). The master

role not only identifies him as a minister but it also identifies his occupation in relation to other roles he plays.

In addition to those roles that are identified as occupational, the clergyman plays many non-occupational roles. He is a citizen, a community resident (unless he is a member of a religious order), he has kinship roles, he may be a family man (unless he is single or has taken a vow of celibacy), and he has a social status role.

It is assumed that his non-occupational roles are in a sense subservient to the master role. As citizen, the minister is not free to act without regard to his role as minister. As family man, the minister, his wife and children are not free to act without considering his master role. The traditional community image of the p.k. (preacher's kid) and the social control function of gossip in relation to the minister's wife underline the interlocking nature of the master role and the subservient non-occupational roles.

II

Ministers have different orientations to their master role. In their professional relations with people and groups their behavior may have different goal orientations. In this research the minister's goal orientation, or frame of reference to his work, is called the integrative role. It is the end toward which he is working in his professional relationship with parishioners, church associations, community groups, and the general public. It is what he is trying to accomplish with people in the professional practice of religion.

The minister is not of necessity aware of the behavioral functions of the integrative role. He may never have been analytic about his behavior from the perspective of

¹A shortened revision of a paper presented at the Biennial meeting of the American Association of schools of Religious Education, Cincinnati, Ohio, December 28, 1957.

²The research data analyzed in this paper were collected while the author was visiting professor of Social Science at Union Theological Seminary, New York, with a grant from the Russell Sage Foundation.

³This analysis of parish ministerial roles is an expansion of the system of categories used in earlier, preliminary reports. The informants whose roles are reported are the 1,111 college and seminary trained clergymen who cooperated in an action research project conducted under the auspices of Union Theological Seminary, New York, and the Russell Sage Foundation. Four other seminaries participated in the project: The Protestant Episcopal Seminary, Alexandria, Virginia; The Louisville Presbyterian Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky; The School of Religion (Disciples), Butler University, Indianapolis, Indiana; Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Illinois. Through the Department of Town and Country Church and the Department of Urban Church, National Council of Churches, twenty-two Protestant denominations cooperated. The social characteristics of the ministerial informants are included in a forthcoming report tentatively entitled *The Protestant Parish Minister — A Behavioral Science Interpretation*.

the integrative role. He may, or may not, be conscious of the way in which it gives direction to his ministerial behavior.

We have now identified the master role, and the integrative roles. Brief parenthetical reference is made to the practitioner roles which are behaviorally oriented.⁴ They are performed by the minister as a means to an end (or goal). Ministers may preach for different purposes. The intent of one minister in preaching (a means oriented practitioner role) may be to be persuasive to the non-believer, or to evangelize (a goal oriented integrative role). Another may preach to instruct the believer, or to edify or to educate; another may preach to bring judgement to the community, or to be prophetic.

III

Clergymen may be identified by the differing ways in which the goal orientation of their role behavior is structured. In this research fourteen integrative role categories are used for the analysis.⁵ The general practitioner evidences no identifiable dominant integrative role. Five of the roles appear to have a traditional orientation: believer-saint, scholar, evangelist, liturgist, and father-shepherd. Eight of the integrative role categories appear to have a contemporary orientation: the interpersonal relations specialist, the parish promoter, the community problem solver, the educator, the specialist in a subculture, the representative of the church-at-large, the lay minister, and the church politician.

The brevity of this article does not permit a full discussion of the methodology for identifying the integrative roles of infor-

⁴The practitioner roles are briefly described and analyzed in an earlier article: Samuel W. Blizzard, "The Minister's Dilemma," *The Christian Century*, April 25, 1956.

⁵The integrative role analysis was developed jointly with the Rev. George A. Lee. Coding of integrative role orientation of each parish minister informant was supervised by Mr. Lee. Harriet B. Blizzard gave invaluable aid in many ways. The author gratefully acknowledges this assistance, and accepts full responsibility for the interpretation of the research reported in this article.

mants.⁶ The integrative roles require analysis in depth and are derived by a content analysis of themes. These themes tend to reoccur in an extended discussion. It was not possible to identify these roles by direct, structured questioning. The full and intense responses from informants in the present study permit the identification of the integrative roles that are used by the minister as he gives goal direction to his professional behavior in the master role through the practitioner roles.

Four indicators were used in the content analysis procedure to identify each informant's integrative role(s). First, the key statement — the minister's summary in intense and expressive language of the essence of what he is really trying to do in his job. Second, the frequency with which he mentions a certain role and fails to discuss other roles. Third, and fourth, the peer and mentor referents he identifies or associates with his way of doing things.

The major purpose of this article is to identify and describe briefly the various integrative roles. The proportion of ministerial informants using a given role primarily is indicated.⁷ Each informant was scored on all the integrative role patterns. However, for brevity those in a secondary and less dominant relationship are not included in this report. There is no attempt to analyze them in relation to such variables as denomination, size of church, regional location, community type or social characteristics of the clergy informants.

IV

The general practitioner does many things for different reasons. His goals are relative and his ministry is not dominated by one specific integrative role. He holds three or more integrative roles with the same relative intensity. He balances off and is dis-

⁶A fuller discussion on the methodology of the project is included in the forthcoming report — *The Protestant Parish Minister — A Behavioral Science Interpretation*.

⁷The proportion of ministers in each integrative role category is preliminary and is subject to further checking before final percentages are published.

criminating. He makes a conscious effort to include the many aspects of the minister's work in some workable scheme. About one minister in fourteen is a general practitioner.

V

Traditionally, the *believer-saint* integrative role pattern has been normative for the clergymen. The *believer-saint* is an exemplar for others to follow because he is dependent upon God. He conceives himself primarily as a "man of faith" who humbly seeks God's will. Some of the qualities of character structure that reflect this integrative role are: (1) prayerfulness, (2) submissiveness, and (3) permissiveness. The *believer-saint* was a primary integrative role orientation for one in fourteen informants.

The *believer-saint* may refer to himself in the following phrases: "The minister cannot go with anyone else beyond his own spiritual experience." "The minister's first task is to be sure of his own health of soul." In a peer referent he may explain: "I seek to know people who are interested in finding the will of God." In a mentor relationship he may report: "It was through (this professor's) saintly personality I came to understand the incarnation."

Traditionally the ministry has been one of the learned professions. In many Protestant denominations the robe of office is an academic rather than an ecclesiastical garment. The clergymen's office is called a study. His scholarly life is characterized by a patient examination of the Scriptures, a perspective on church history, and full knowledge of the doctrine of the church and its interpretation. The minister is supposed to go beyond a simple acceptance of Christianity into a search for truth. The minister is expected to know the technical facts about religion regardless of the educational level required by a particular denomination. The more broadly oriented scholar type is interested in a general study of society and culture, but this is a peripheral interest for many. The minister whose integrative role is that of *scholar* may

see it as an end in itself. He will go beyond the clergymen who sees scholarship as a spiritual discipline or as a means to a more effective performance of the practitioner roles. Very few (one in seventy-five) of the informants had scholar as a primary integrative role.

Ministers whose integrative role is that of *scholar* refer to themselves as follows: "The minister has been set aside by his people to have time to study and contemplate in order to better interpret God's will to those who are his members and constituents who have not had theological opportunity for intensive study." In a peer referent he may suggest: "I like to associate with professional leaders and teachers who have had formal schooling and education." He may identify with a mentor because of his "scholarly interpretation of the scriptures."

VI

The *evangelist* integrative role pattern suggests a functional orientation within a normative frame of reference. The minister is dedicated to a "call" to proclaim the Word. He feels compelled to preach the Word and to save souls. This type of minister's faith is like a rock, it is unshakeable. Often he deals in 'blacks' and 'whites,' feeling that 'shades of gray' would compromise his position. Hence this role pattern may harbor in some a type of authoritarianism. One-twelfth of the clergy in this project have evangelism as a primary integrative role.

The evangelist feels that "the only program (his) church has is the salvation of souls." Or he may offer this key statement: "There is no substitute in the parish ministry of telling people through your actions and words about Jesus Christ." "In my ministry I am concerned about the problem of conversion, how to present the church to the people in it and to others seeking admission." As peer or mentor referents those who have this integrative role may cite either fellow clergy who have conducted evangelistic meetings for them or a national big name evangelist.

The *liturgical* integrative role pattern focuses on a definite concrete ritual. The liturgy is essential for the church to exist and is seen as a near perfect blending of belief and action. Identification with this role as integrative may include an appreciation for the aesthetic. The beauty of worship is more important than the congregation. Liturgy for the purist is an end in itself; for the middle-of-the-roader it is the device by which the grace of God is mediated. Less than one per cent of the informants in this research are liturgists from the point of view of a primary integrative role.

A few expressions that represent the integrative role as the liturgist views it are: "(celebrating Holy Eucharist) is a parish priest's greatest privilege and when I am offering the Holy Communion and I am praying the prayer of the church, then I am supremely happy." "I derive the most personal enjoyment celebrating the Sacrament — in assisting clergy in such services."

One-fifth of the clergy in this project have as a primary integrative role the *Father-shepherd* pattern. The minister is a strong figure. Implicit in the *Father-shepherd* role is the fact that the minister is a man of unshakeable faith; in his presence God is near to man. This minister is like a comforting father to his children. As a shepherd of the flock he understands and protects them. The specifics in church work do not have to be accounted for by the *Father-shepherd*. Without doing any specific duty he performs an adequate service to his church in his own mind and in the mind of his parishioners if he is himself and is near when needed. People accept the minister for what he is and for the meaning that his presence puts into the routines as well as the crises of their lives. Thus the routine pastoral calling, cheering the sick and being with the dying, visiting the new born and the aged in his congregation all are part of a good day's work. The *Father-shepherd* speaks of his mentor as "a wise pastor and a great churchman," and as "a man of prayer, patience and

poise." When he describes ministers oriented to this integrative role he may suggest: "He can break the bread of life for men and feed them. . . . He can stand by a family facing disgrace and know what it means to be God's man for them. He can sometimes say a quiet word to the sick and feel the very current of God's power flowing through him. He can sit with anxious parents waiting the outcome of an operation on a child, and finding them gaining calm because he is there."

VII.

The minister who integrates his roles as an *interpersonal relations specialist* is analogous to those who are *Father-shepherds*, except that the latter is traditionally oriented and the former is oriented to contemporary values. The *interpersonal relations specialist* thinks that to truly "love people," as every minister should, he must understand them. In understanding and counseling members of his congregation and others the minister gets close to their soul. The source of his understanding is his identification with lay psychiatrists. He believes so much in the effectiveness of this role that he undergoes therapy himself. Hence the implementation of this role is more specific than that of the *Father-shepherd*. *Interpersonal relations* deals with specific interacting personalities instead of the diffuse "flock." Through this type of integrative role the minister looks on all the practitioner roles in the context of *interpersonal relations*. The *interpersonal relations specialist* approach is taken by one-sixth of the informants. As a peer referent one minister reported: "The most helpful person has been a psychology professor who is one of our members. . . . I have spent an hour a week for four months with (him) . . . as a result, I am less compulsive and more effective, both personally and professionally." Key statements that identify this integrative role are: "Increasingly my ministry becomes a series of conferences with people who have crucial problems." "I feel the need personally to understand human personality (my own and others) better to relate the various

functions of a church to this understanding in a creative way."

The *parish promoter* is a primary integrative role for every seventh informant. Those who have this orientation apply the skills of the secular organizer and promoter to the local church system. The successful business man who organizes his personnel and promotes his program is the role model of this type of ministerial respondent. This minister seeks to run a smooth organization that measures its effectiveness by statistical standards of attendance, new members, budget, variety of organizational structures, and recognition by national headquarters for cooperativeness in the denominationally recommended program. The mentor of the parish promoter is seen in this admission: "Some of my best guidance comes from hard-headed business men." In identifying his peer referents another informant states: "I like to 'pick' the mind of other clergy especially. 'Have you done this or met this problem?'" Some key statements that portray the parish promoter are: "There are . . . some cliques in this church that have been prevented from dominating the entire life of the church. A pastor of a church of this nature needs to be adroit at knowing when to yield and when to give ground, but if he gives too much ground he will be on the run. How on earth do you develop leaders and still keep them in their place?" "The minister is primarily a leader of leaders in the organizational life of the church . . . he must recruit them, define their job, get them trained and give them a deep consecration for their task."

The *community problem solver* integrative role, held in primary relationship by more than one-tenth, is related to the parish promoter role. In this case the minister conceives his interest and skill as an organizer extending out to community, national, and international issues. The minister may conceive his role as somewhat akin to the Israelite prophets of Old Testament times or he may be a crusader with a social welfare orientation. His choice of these two justifications will depend on the extent of his sacred or secular ideology. He

may identify himself closely with the interest of labor, political or social welfare groups and causes. The community problem solver may admire a mentor referent because he has "strong Christian convictions on social issues which (he is) not afraid to express." As peers he may identify "community leaders in social and civic work." A key statement made by a minister with this type of integrative role orientation reported: "The crying need is that the church be more than a social club of middle class, successful people. It must find some ways to strike harder at (social) problems (crime, alcoholism, delinquency, war, secularism, immorality, neuroticism)."

VIII.

The *educator* integrative role represents the primary goal orientation of one in twenty-five. The role of educator is seen as the most valid expression of the ministry by those in this pattern. Religious education is viewed as the major program of the church. Within this area there are plans to be made, leaders to be recruited and trained and groups to be supervised. The educator must understand the basic philosophy of education, know the needs and abilities of children and young people, and possess certain special skills associated with an educational program. The minister-educator may hold a theological position that is somewhat independent of the educational method. His religious ideology may range from conservative to liberal, but it is important that he be committed to the basic goal of religious education. This goal is that faith be communicated appropriately and comprehensively at every age level. To implement this goal a full program involving all resources of the church is in order. Some key statements give further meaning to the educator as an integrating role. "I enjoy most the aspect of Christian education including the pulpit, church school, home visits, classes, youth and adult programming." "We must instruct all persons — individually, at group meetings, at services, counseling, etc. We must teach through sermons, through special confirma-

tion classes, reaching non-church people through personnel and contact."

The *sub-cultural specialist* is a primary integrative role for one in fifty. This role helps the minister see his work from the perspective of whatever group that he chooses for his ministry. It may be the rural ministry or the inner city, or the suburbs. He may consider himself a specialist in ministering to laboring people or to an ethnic group. The subcultural specialist will have strong motivation and interest. Being a rural minister or a minister in an inner city area will be a way of life for him. He will think of it as requiring special skills that are not required in other ministries.

A few key statements will illustrate this type: "I chose the rural ministry deliberately. I feel that many of my seminary professors, classmates and other friends and relatives think I am wasting my time up in the north woods and getting nowhere." "I believe my work in the city church is most effective . . . I would not want another type of ministry." "I work five days a week in the — factory. I do my pastoral work, studying, etc. evenings and Saturday. I accept from my church the difference between my factory earnings and the cash salary in my call. This way I am closely identified with the factory workers who are the core of my parish."

The *"lay" minister* approach to an integrative role is a reaction to the uniqueness of the minister in a sacred role. It involves an implicit anti-clericalism. There is a conscious effort to identify with lay people. The minister is afraid of being a stuffed shirt; he wants to "be just like everyone else." He sees himself as practicing the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. The minister is just like other believers except that he devotes more time to the church and may have more training. He avoids clerical garb and may dress like the lay persons in his parish, even when officiating at church functions. He can do "a man's work" and can speak in the language of the man of the street rather than merely in technical religious language. About one in twenty-five

is oriented to this integrative role on a primary basis.

The clergymen whose integrative role is that of the "lay" minister describe themselves in the following key statements: "I have fought to overcome the professionalism in the ministry, the loss of Protestant understanding of Christian vocation, the priesthood of all believers." "We are all laymen. The minister is a more educated layman. The minister may not be a more dedicated layman; he must be able to communicate with people where they are. . . ."

The *representative of the church-at-large* is an integrative role for one informant in fifty. This type is oriented to the community rather than strictly to the local congregation. This minister is warm-hearted and mixes well with people; he is a Christ-like Rotarian. In his attempt to be a servant of the whole community he may express his ideology in cliches and shop-worn phrases. He wants to be "like Christ" or the "friend of man" in the Edgar Guest tradition. Since there are no parish limits to his pastoral work, he may appear to lack focus and have a diffused ministry. He may "minister" to a person who happens to occupy a seat next to him on a bus, plane, or train. He may hear "confession," marry and bury the churchless and the excommunicated of the community. The representative of the church-at-large may speak of his mentor as a "tried, trusted and accredited friend at large." He may honor a peer who ministers to a fashionable congregation but who insists on ministering to those on the wrong side of the tracks. When describing his own ministry he refers to "my work as a friend, a fellow traveler — along life's road — together we can learn and grow and pray and sing and find a greater purpose and joy in life." Or he may report: "I make a particular point of calling most on the outcaste and poor in the community, for it is here that the greatest needs, emotional, physical, psychological and spiritual seem to exist, and once you get to know these people, they seem to be the ones who will most readily come to you and ask for help."

The *church politician* is a primary integrative role for only one in a hundred. This minister is a system follower or the organization man. As an integrative role it is a product of an explicit or implicit hierarchical system. The minister feels that his purposes are best forwarded by conformity to this system. He will stress cooperative work or connectional work. In a sense denominational matters are part of every minister's work, but for some this is dominant and integrative. They feel that it has its own built in security system. Their professional creed is: 'take care of the system and the system will take care of you.' It does not depend on knowledge, skill, or understanding on the part of the minister, but simply upon his ability to obey orders and glory in following them.

IX

The integrative role analysis explores one possible way in which the parish minister gives purposeful focus to the many dimensions of his work. It gives meaning to some of the ambiguity associated with the minister in contemporary society.

This analysis suggests that four integrative role patterns are primary for almost two-thirds of the parish ministers studied. These role patterns are oriented to the world of people rather than the world of ideas.

The father-shepherd, the interpersonal relations specialist, the parish promoter, and the community problem solver patterns may have varying ideological undertones but essentially they involve interpersonal, intra-group and inter-group relations. Two role patterns are primarily integrative for more than one-sixth of the informants. They are the believer-saint, and the evangelist. Both of these integrative roles are ideologically oriented.

The remaining eight integrative roles are held primarily by one-fifth of the ministers researched. Aside from the general practitioner, no one of the residual is a primary integrative role for more than one in twenty-five. This is notable since the educator, the sub-cultural specialist and possibly the liturgist is strongly recommended by church executives and theological educators. Analysis of integrative roles held in a secondary relationship may indicate greater utility for them.

Role ambiguity raises many problems for the contemporary Protestant parish minister. This article has explored one avenue by which intra-personal aspects of it may be systematized and role conflicts resolved. Further research and self-examination by parish clergy is required to evaluate the integrative role in relation to role conflict.

Interreligious Relationships: CONFLICT, COMPETITION, AND COOPERATION With Special Reference to Public Education*

George Huntston Williams

Winn Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Divinity School of Harvard University

I AGREE WITH Dr. Leo Pfeffer, deservedly renowned authority on the problems of church-state relations, that we must face forthrightly the facts of interfaith conflict in American society; but I am not at all so negative as is he about the possibilities of interfaith cooperation and mutual understanding. Hence, I should like to subtitle my remarks: "Conflict, Competition, and Cooperation."

It will be useful to set out some areas of cooperation and significant interchange.

My colleague at Harvard in New Testament studies, who came to us three years ago from the University of Upsala, told me the other day that the omnipresence of Jews and Judaism on the American scene had made him rethink the whole of his subject in terms of its Jewish significance. He remarked further that the phrase "Judeo-Christian tradition," which has become standard among American theologians and publicists, is virtually unknown in Europe, a tribute to the significant role that Judaism has acquired in the American Christian conscience and, I assume, the other way around. I know, for my part as an historian of the Church, that the newer texts and monographs being produced by American Christians are giving increased attention to the almost two millennia of relations between Jews and Christians, their mystery, their tragedy, and perhaps their promise of much brighter and even spiritually luminous chapters ahead. A colleague of mine in Church history at Chicago is preparing a documented account of the rise and universal acceptance of the now

standard and amicable grouping of Americans as "Protestants, Catholics, and Jews"—with prayer and invocation by the representatives of each at our national political conventions and with placards in our subways and buses urging us to attend the church or synagogue of our choice. It has become patriotic and civic, almost everywhere in our land, to insist upon the coordinate rights and contributions of Protestants, Catholics and Jews.

We cannot dismiss this achievement as socially superficial or religiously relativistic. At its best, at least, it suggests a basically American sense of fair play, as it might be popularly expressed, or of a mutually respectful, mutually critical and perhaps competitive pluralism, as both Dr. Pfeffer and I might agree to call it. Increasingly, the representatives of the three major religious groupings are being brought together in interfaith forums and projects under neutral or religious auspices. The Jewish community has made notable contributions in these projects, in civic organizations and community philanthropy. Jews are widely known to have exceeded others far out of proportion to their numbers and their wealth—all this in addition to their massive contributions to purely Jewish projects. Nor are the members of the Catholic Church and the Protestant denominations unaware of the fact that in the juvenile delinquency which ravages and baffles us today Jewish youth has been relatively uninvolved, while Jewish family life is almost idealized for its solidarity by those outside the Jewish community.

But there are conflicts and misunderstandings and to these we turn. I do not wish to deal with the still large pockets of

*An address, substantially as delivered at the National Biennial Convention, American Jewish Congress, Hotel Carillon, Miami Beach, Fla., May 16, 1958.

social discrimination committed by Gentiles nor the largely inadvertent social monopolization that sometimes occurs when the Jewish community here and there has the majority status. These tensions can best be understood in terms of majority-minority social dynamics. In any event, they no longer have on either side, an explicitly theological or religious motivation. Indeed, I think it can be said in solemn joy that after almost two millennia of conflict between Jews and Christians, we have reached the point in our pilgrimage here in the secular promised land of constitutional separation of the Church from the coercive power of the State — we have reached, I say, the point where we no longer have a theological motivation in opposing one another but rather a fresh theological motivation for understanding our alienation. In any event, for the first time the resources of Jewish and Christian theology may be called upon to clarify and hence to relieve social tension rather than aggravating it as in the past. The Pope's now famous dictum that "we are all spiritually Semites" has found parallel formulation in the Protestant conviction of some mysterious solidarity with God's ongoing Israel of History. Suffice it then to say that intergroup conflicts, though they be fought out with religious epithets and ethnic jeers, can also be solved in our New World setting precisely by an appeal to the higher and profounder religious convictions on all sides.

Nor do I wish to speak very much about political conflict. I count myself a friend of the State of Israel by reason of my convictions both as a democratic citizen and as a Christian, mourning, at a distance, for what the land of Albertus Magnus, Martin Luther, and Friedrich Schleiermacher, in a perverted frenzy of nationalism, inflicted on the Jews. But even the many Christians who rejoice in the achievement of Israel, now celebrating her tenth anniversary, cannot blink away the new strain that has come into Jewish-Christian relations. It is perfectly understandable that Jewish children in all-day schools or synagogue schools in New York City should be more inter-

ested in studying about, and saving money for, the afforestation of the Negev than for reforestation in the Adirondacks. It is the pedagogical equivalent of various Christian efforts to make world missions vivid and personal. But members of the Jewish community themselves see how even the distinction between loyalty to the Peoplehood and loyalty to the State of Israel can over the years create difficulties. Indeed, all groups in our religiously pluralistic society must be prepared to review periodically our overseas religious loyalties and responsibilities as they may affect the welfare of the whole of the religiously neutral commonwealth of which we are a part as American citizens.

And here I come to a major point, agreeing with Dr. Pfeffer, that the crucial issue concerns the extent to which any religious group may seek "to translate its own particular hierarchy of social values into categorical imperatives for the community at large." I would say that no group has the right to impose its peculiar standards upon the community at large but at the same time no religious community should be inhibited in its deep impulse to find appropriate public manifestations of its conviction.

The key word is public manifestation, not public coercion or interference.

Up to the establishment of the State of Israel, Jews in America everywhere had been content to limit the expressions of religion to the local Jewish community, withdrawn into itself most intensely precisely on the high and holy days and in the family celebrations recollecting the history of God's redeeming acts. Today Jews press for public recognition of the place of Israel among the nations. This is, to be sure, not primarily a religious but rather a communitarian issue which can be argued out on the level of campaign politics; but in any event it is a subject as existential and also as fraught with public significance as the social or political policies of the Catholic Church and many of the Protestant denominations. Since it is superficially a political issue, the Jewish community may be

reluctant to see the parallel. I mention it only to indicate that all three major religious groupings are, so to speak, involved in politics or as I should prefer to say, equally concerned to find appropriate public manifestations of the deepest convictions of the group, even to the point of involving fellow-Americans not so motivated.

Dr. Pfeffer has quite correctly, I believe, judged the temper of the main Protestant denominations when he says that on most civil libertarian issues they are disposed to side with the Jewish and Secular Idealists over against the Catholic Church except on the matter of religious instruction in connection with the public schools. He has put his finger on the issue which for Protestants is at once religious and political as is the issue of the survival and development of the State of Israel for the American Jewish community.

Biblical religion and our American form of democracy are inextricably related in the minds of main-line American Protestants. They adhere to the principle of the separation of Church and State but they feel that the ultimate sanctions of our democratic commonwealth are ultimately Judaeo-Christian and they are therefore groping for a formula which will safeguard the integrity and religious neutrality of the public schools while communicating something of the substance of the Judaeo-Christian tradition to the ongoing generation, not that the children become Christians but that they be publicly instructed in the rudiments of the Western and specifically the American heritage.

Now the Jewish community, of course, and especially this Congress is very strict in the interpretation of the principle of separation and has won many a civil-libertarian battle before the courts to the ultimate advantage of the community at large. Even in school districts in the great metropolitan concentrations of Jews, not the slightest attempt has been made to adjust the school year to the convenience of the majority, even though the exodus of Jewish children on the high holy days may leave the classrooms nearly empty and in-

struction pointless. And this is because the Jewish community is, on principle and out of the millennial experience of Jewry, unwilling to trespass upon the Gentile public or, by taking advantage of a local situation, inadvertently to establish a precedent for a breach in the wall separating organized religion and the agencies of government. There are two forces operative here, I am saying, a congenital indisposition to externalize or publicize Judaism and a prudent and patriotic adherence to a sound constitutional principle.

Catholicism and both classical and cultural Protestantism have in contrast externalized or publicized on principle. Their basic theological proclamation is the coming of a kingdom; and the Christian life is understood as a subduing of the kingdoms of this world in anticipation of the Kingdom of Christ. Hence processions in the streets on saints' days and the great festivities of the Christian calendar, liturgical coronations, military and institutional chaplaincies, the imposition of the sabbath rest on saint and sinner, believer and unbeliever, so that even the birds are imagined to sing differently on a Puritan sabbath — are all manifestations, historic and contemporary, of the inherently public and socially penetrative impulses of Catholic and normative Protestant Christianity.

Thus, the Catholic Church with its concern for public morality, the Protestant denominations with their concern for the nurture of the democratic ethos and religious instruction somehow connected with public education, and now the Jewish community with its quickened concern for the State of Israel and minority rights — all have a public or political drive, religiously and ethically motivated, which brings each community into the forum of public debate and the arena of group pressures.

Some new theory must be worked out for the coexistence not only of individual believers. This we have firmly established in our constitutions, our customs, and our Supreme Court decisions ever more sensitive to the inviolable rights of conscience. But we must also demarcate the proper and

mutually respected limits of the public and corporate expression of religious conviction. To what extent may a minority or a majority press for the public recognition or toleration or implementation of its views by such methods as censorship, boycott, and lobbying and in such matters as religious instruction, sabbath laws, and certain medical, hygienic, dietary, and slaughtering practices without violating the constitutional principle of the separation of Church and State, that is the complete and mutually beneficent independence of churches and synagogues in their various religious activities and agencies from the financial, administrative, and coercive powers of the municipalities, county and state governments, and the Federal government?

Let us return to the one issue about which Protestants feel most strongly. Having safeguarded both organized religion from the improper coercion from the state and having safeguarded the state, benevolently neutral in respect to theology, worship, and religious ethics, from interference by organized religion, we need not be forced to construe the principle of separation to inhibit the public and social character of organized religion as long as the rules of competition are observed.

The Jewish community, for the most part, the Secular Idealists, and some Protestant denominations are opposed to the arrangement for religious instruction on time released by the public schools. Released-time religious education has been declared, however, constitutional, as long as instruction takes place away from public school precincts; but it can still be objected to, both from the point of view of religion as inadequate and sometimes ineffective; and, from the point of view of social relations at school, divisive.

I do not care to go further into the much discussed problem of released time but prefer to discuss the possibility of direct instruction in the public schools of one segment of religious history, namely, the history of Israel from Abraham to the return from the Exile.

It is an anomaly of the American scene

that such a proposal should have to be most stoutly defended precisely before a Jewish congress!

Mine is a specific proposal which, without further elaboration, most of you would turn down on principle or rather on three principles. First you might well argue that to give any time to the history of ancient Israel in the public schools would be an egregious violation of the principle of separation. Secondly, the history of Israel belongs primarily to the Jews and could not be fairly or properly recounted, however briefly and circumspectly, by public school teachers. And thirdly, even if it be granted that the history of ancient Israel is important for Catholics and Protestants as well as for Jews, to impose such subject matter, however limited, would be an improper intrusion into a crowded curriculum that must be of equal value for pupils from secular or secularized homes as from families in the Judaeo-Christian traditions.

Since mine is an earnest proposal and since a clarification of it will throw light on a number of related issues as well, I am going to take the time to speak to each of the three objections on principle.

The first objection is that such instruction is a violation of the principle of separating church and state. For Jews, studying the Law and worshipping God are so close that to bring the study of a segment of hallowed history into the public class room seems to be a surreptitious introduction of sectarian religion within the precincts of the State. For Catholics and Protestants, the distinction between study and worship is much easier to draw and hence many Protestants who might, like myself, object to classroom prayers and Bible-reading as exercises in religious devotion, would find a factual treatment of a segment of biblical history constitutionally legitimate. In a moment I should like to suggest why such instruction would be eminently desirable, but I wish first to indicate how even with Jewish sensibilities in mind the objective treatment of ancient Israel's history from Abraham to the return from the Exile would not necessarily be a violation of a

constitutional principal. Notice that the creation narratives would be left out.

A knowledge of the factual history as it can be recovered from the Bible and from archaeological studies is surely as important for a young American as knowledge of the glories of Athens and Rome. Western society cannot be understood without Jerusalem. Yet the third strand in Western civilization is systematically left out of our public school instruction as though it belonged exclusively to synagogue and church. Our children may learn in the public schools about Daniel Boone but not about Joshua. They learn about Abraham Lincoln but more than 40% have not even a hazy notion of the patriarch for whom he was named. They may learn about the Seminoles here in Florida but not about the Amorites. They may even study about the Pilgrims crossing the Atlantic to colonize in the wilderness and about the Mayflower compact, and they may draw pictures of Thanksgiving harvests and Puritan hospitality; but they may not study about the children of Israel crossing the Red Sea and the forty years in the wilderness of Sinai. Yet this is a part of the epic of the West, an essential ingredient in the American heritage, whether a child comes from a religious or a non-observant home.

Almost every American family cherishes personal recollections or family traditions about their crossing of the Atlantic and the fresh start in the New World, or the moving West in the vast wilderness of the interior. Many of our forebears saw their crossing of the Atlantic or their trek westward as in some deep sense a repetition of the earlier flight from bondage in Egypt through the Red Sea to the Promised Land. This recurrent image has molded the character of the American mind. All our children, whether they come from religious homes or not, should have this basic narrative as a part of their general education. The account need not, perhaps should not, be given in biblical language, but the undisputed facts should be a part of their lore.

And this brings us to objection number three, that such subject matter is of no

concern to the 40% of the population unconnected with Judeo-Christian institutions. I would have the subject taught as history, not as religion, as part of the background of Western civilization and the American heritage. To Secular Idealists and non-believers I would say that this much biblical history is important as history and need not be treated explicitly as religion and segregated from all other subjects. Young Americans should be enabled to see how they, through the American heritage, belong to a great tradition stretching back to the beginnings, quite apart from their personal faith, obedience, and worship.

And this brings us back to the second objection, the really crucial question of whether it is possible to teach a selection from biblical history objectively but respectfully, without impairing its rich tissue of significance for both Jews and Christians. And perhaps the crucial point is not even whether it can be taught objectively, but whether by limiting the biblical material to a portion of the Bible, indeed a segment of the Hebrew Bible, leaving out the New Testament altogether, we would be either favoring or disfavoring the Jewish community. As to whether an elementary or secondary school syllabus for the history of Israel from Abraham through the Exile could be agreed upon by Jewish educators remains to be seen. It is pertinent to remark, however, that in the constitutionally secular State of Israel, Biblical history is taught as an aspect of national history. Nevertheless, references to the Deity are not expurgated from the texts! The observant and the secular Israeli children are free to interpret the meaning of these texts as they will. In any event the teaching of some kind of material in simplified form should not be, out of hand, considered a question of church and state but of the public recognition in the realm of education, of that third strand in the evolution of Western civilization which a doctrinaire interpretation of the principle of separation has unnecessarily uprooted from American public education.

Nowhere in the world today do Jews, Catholics, Protestants and Secularists get on so well as in America, despite our conflicts. Historically, we are as indebted to Jerusalem as to Athens and to Rome for polity, freedoms and ideals. We should give public recognition to this historic datum in our public curriculum.

Tertullian, an early theologian, once asked rhetorically, speaking as a Christian, what has Jerusalem to do with Athens?, implying that Christianity had nothing to do with the learning symbolized by Athens. I would say as a Protestant Christian, and as a democratic citizen concerned for the tutelage of the prophetic conscience in our society and for our democratic institutions, that Jerusalem has much to do with Athens, that is, with learning; and with Rome, that is, with the arts of statesmanship and citizenship.

The story of Jerusalem in the history of mankind is a part of the full heritage of American children, whether Jews, Christians, or from the homes of non-believers.

Let us turn an arena of conflict into a realm of cooperation and mutual understanding, without violating a constitutional principle or without watering down the facts of our common history.

Ours is not a Christian country, nor is it secular or Jewish. It is a mixed commonwealth; but, as long as the synagogues and the churches are understood, in our pluralistic democracy, to be alone responsible for the religious indoctrination of children, for their ethical tutelage, and for divine worship (with the consent or at the request of their parents), I see no fundamental objection to, and every reason for rounding out the education of our children in the public schools by the inclusion of the commonly accepted historical materials about ancient Israel at appropriate intervals in the public school curricula.

Let us assume that American Society and especially its educational institutions have, in enough places, reached that level of maturation which will permit biblical scholars in diverse religious groupings to agree on the basic material that could be successfully integrated into a high school course in the

history of civilization. The amount of general history in the public schools is in any event so limited that the inclusion of proportionate amounts of biblical history should cause no difficulty.

Emphatically, one should not support this moderate innovation as a first step towards including thereafter an account of Christian beginnings; for at this point Americans have divergent heritages; and what might be taught with propriety in a religiously homogeneous society, could not in fairness be imposed in the United States, regardless of the objectivity of the instruction.

My proposal is thus quite limited, but nevertheless, fundamental, namely, that in our abiding by the principle of the separation of organized religion and the agencies of government, we not so disfigure the learning child's image of his world that, by a kind of inadvertent inversion of our constitutional principle, we *negate* in the realm of education what we once resolved merely to *separate* in the realm of polity.

As long as the personal religious or non-religious views of the teacher and the pupil are not violated, and in the measure that the community comes to repose its confidence in the pedagogical wisdom of its teachers (as it does with its doctors and lawyers) and upholds their professional freedom and dignity and their solidarity with that larger guild which includes university professors as joint stewards of truth, may we not look forward to a time when the strange blank in the public classroom map of the Near East and the millennial gap in the history of Western civilization is regularly filled in without the teacher's feeling any sense of trespassing upon a constitutional principle?

Americans have more in common than they at present share in the public educative process with their children, who, however, if they are not made to feel that they belong to the past, also may not belong even to the future, but only to the maddening, frenzied contemporaneity of a world at strife, without perspectives, without roots, — without a vision because they know not whence they came.

Christian Education – A Process of Becoming*

Gordon E. Jackson

Professor of Philosophy of Religion and Religious Education, The Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary

THE THESIS of this paper is that Christian education has one ultimate objective which is redemption and this objective must be seen within the process of becoming. Within that process there are several proximate goals which are means to, or exemplification of, the ultimate objective. It is the presupposition of this paper that while the Biblical and theological point of view is definitive for Christian education, process philosophy and the social sciences furnish illuminating insight.

The Ultimate Objective

The ultimate objective of Christian education is redemption. In the Biblical drama God acts not only to create but also to re-create man. After the first scene the drama has to do with the redemptive or recreative activity of God. The recurrent theme of the Bible, so clearly set forth within the covenants God cut with Israel, is fourfold: first, there is God's gracious gift of himself; second, his requirement of obedience; third, Israel's turning away and subsequent punishment; and fourth, God's going after Israel once more to make Israel his people. The drama comes to its climax in the Christ-Event where in the whole event, Jesus Christ, God gives himself for his people. As Dr. Reuel Howe has put it, "The Being of God made Himself known in Jesus through a living face-to-face encounter with men in order that He might bring to our person-hurts His Infinite Person-healing."¹ God in his redemptive activity has been working to re-relate us to himself and to one another. Redemption then is a new relationship toward God and

toward others. The Bible employs many ways to describe this relationship but it is most succinctly defined in the two laws: love of God and love of neighbor. In his book, *The Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry*, Dr. Richard Niebuhr says,

. . . no substitute can be found for the definition of the goal of the church as the increase among men of the love of God and neighbor. The terms vary; now the symbolic phrase is reconciliation to God and man, now increase of gratitude for the forgiveness of sin, now the realization of the kingdom or the coming of the Spirit, now the acceptance of the gospel. But the simple language of Jesus Christ himself furnishes to most Christians the most intelligible key to his own purpose and to that of the community gathered around him. If the increase among men of love of God and neighbor is the ultimate objective may it not be that many of our confusions and conflicts in churches and seminaries are due to failure to keep this goal in view while we are busy in the pursuit of proximate ends that are indeed important, but which set us at cross-purposes when followed without adequate reference to the final good?²

For one to be in this new relationship between God and neighbor, he must be a new self. Every person is the intersection of myriad influences. The past in all its multiplicity endures into the present and the future with its realm of possibility impinges upon the present. Each self is a certain kind of unity out of the past with reference to the future. It is this particular self in this particular moment as it relates to its past and its future. How it relates to its own milieu is its novelty as a self. Each self has a center of integration around which the interrelationships are woven. In the Biblical sense of redemption God becomes the integrating center of a person's life. God is involved in the drama of the

*An address delivered to the Professors' and Research Section, Division of Christian Education of the National Council of Churches, Omaha, Neb., February, 1958.

¹Reuel L. Howe, *Man's Need and God's Action* (Greenwich: Seabury, 1953), pp. 43, 44.

²Richard Niebuhr, *The Purpose of the Church and Its Ministry* (New York: Harpers, 1956), pp. 31, 32.

self as he confronts each self in every phase of its becoming, purposing for that becoming whatever is relevant and appropriate. That is, God brings to each self what it needs and what it can manage where it is. There is a "particular providence" for every becoming. A person's sovereign concern becomes that of doing the will of the seeking God. Such a person is "in Christ." He is a "fresh creation." He has been turned from the falseness of idolatry, whether of self or some other created good, to the living God. He has been saved from emptiness by the indwelling of the Spirit of Christ. The self has been restored to wholeness and knows peace in the sense of *shalom*, integrity.

The role of Christian education is to be the servant of the redemptive God. It is concerned to be a means by which the grace of God restores wholeness to man. This is no static wholeness. Man is embattled, and the pattern of sin and forgiveness continues in the life of the redeemed. Luther's word that man is always becoming Christian is apropos. There is the Fall. "And after . . . the whole lexicon of sin," to borrow from W. H. Auden. But man must also be seen eschatologically: God's redemptive process has begun and looks toward fulfillment. In Bultmann's phrase, we are the Already and the Not Yet. This underscores the doctrine that the gracious working of God in every instant of becoming is the power of the Christian education enterprise. This operation of grace is solely the work of God. The aim of Christian education is to place children, youth, and adults in such centers of experience that the grace of God can make them whole. Christian education is not the manipulation of personality, but the seeking for conditions and opportunities through which the grace of God can become redemptive, restoring persons into those who bear his image. The purpose of Christian education is not merely to facilitate man's social adjustment. It is to enable man to become a whole person in a whole society by the grace of God. Thus Christian education is concerned with the self in the process of its

becoming and with all the relationships which inform the self and to which the self reacts.

The Process of Becoming

With the ultimate objective, man's redemption, and its relation to Christian education stated, we now proceed to view redemption as taking place within the process of becoming and see what this means for Christian education.

Alfred North Whitehead provides us with a framework in which to locate the redemptive process. His metaphysical position was utilized earlier in this paper. Every self has a past which determines to a considerable extent what the present shall be. Also, every self has its future; that is, the possibilities which are relevant to it. The self, with its past flowing into it and with the possibilities for the next moment converging upon it, must come to some determination as to what it will become in this instant of the passage of time. God is impressing upon the becoming self his Will for that particular determination. How the self reacts within this context of relationships will determine *what* the self is in its arrival.

Now the self in the process of taking its world in a certain way, here and now, is the focal point of Christian education. The whole self in the present activity of experiencing its world in reference to the claim of God upon it for this becoming, is the concern of Christian education. Its purpose is to help each person to achieve a certain quality of selfhood: out of multiplicity a definiteness that resembles God. That a definiteness *will* be realized is the inexorability of time. The quality of that definiteness is the concern of Christian education.

Christian education theory has so often neglected the depths of human involvement. It has failed to take seriously the self in the process of becoming. It has forgotten the fullness of each individual's past, the whole, rich, heavy past. This past is felt by and held in the whole psycho-physical organism. Both process phi-

losophy and depth psychology support Biblical theology in its insistence upon viewing man in depth. Christian education operates too often as though the self were static and as though the only response the self had to make was vertically to God. This criticism can be made of Fundamentalism and Barthianism; of Fundamentalism because of its highly rationalistic, doctrinal characters, and of Barthianism because of the vertical character of its divine-human encounter. The statement, Jesus Christ died on the cross, is a clear, concise, abstract statement. But unless a person's appreciable world prepares him for this proposition, the statement will be devoid of meaning. The problem is to perceive the subject and predicate of the statement, Jesus Christ died on the cross, so that the statement becomes deeply meaningful. *How* a self takes that abstract statement into the concreteness of the present moment determines how that past reality lives in the present.

Furthermore, no two selves will ever take any statement in exactly the same way for the route of the past for each self is somewhat different and each self is a novel self relating to the past in novel ways. Therefore, Christian education must be able to allow some novelty of concretion if it is going to deal with the emerging self. If Christian education must demand uniformity in the becoming of each self before God, then it will not be really dealing with the self per se. As David Roberts has so well said, "Acceptance of doctrine can be vital and wholehearted only when it is an attempt to formulate in words and concepts something which actually happens within the life of the man."³ If Christian education can allow within the unity of the creative and redemptive working of God a diversity of interpretation and expression, then it can be in the role of a Socratic mid-wife in the birth of novelty. This will not be sheer novelty, for it will be under duress to its past. But it will be the novelty of each emerging self as it

struggles for integrity in its total response to God within its environment.

The self which we are looking at, the self in the full context of its history, in responding to God and the neighbor does so with its whole being. This is to love God with the heart, mind, soul, and strength. Man as he is seen from the biblical point-of-view is not a flesh-soul dualism as he is in Platonic thought. Biblical psychology sees man as body, as soul, as heart (the seat of the mental life), and as spirit. But the insistence is upon a unified person so that man is not a mind or soul over against a body. As H. Wheeler Robinson has written, "The body, not the soul, is the characteristic element of Hebrew personality."⁴ The thrust of this remark is that the Hebraic concept of body, *basar*, points to man in the totality of his creaturely existence. When man makes his faith-response to the grace of God it is the total psycho-physical organism which acts. The Bible is not concerned with, What shall we think? in an intellectualistic or abstract way. It is concerned with, What shall we do?, meaning how does the total self answer God. It never separates thinking from doing. Man responds obediently with his total self to the self-disclosure of God.

Christian Education and Theology

Christian education, in terms of its ultimate objective, must help the whole self to respond to God. While it is concerned to help men to understand their beliefs, it is also concerned to help men to worship the living God. In keeping with its ultimate objective of redemption and in light of the unity of the self, Christian education can never be satisfied with mere transmission of doctrine. In some circles salvation is adherence to right doctrine and Christian education is the transmission of right doctrine. Theological ideas are presented as the eternal truths which must be believed if one is to be saved. Theological doctrine is rooted in history. It is the Church's persistent effort to understand its experience of grace and to express its own basic mean-

³David Roberts, *Psychotherapy and a Christian View of Man* (New York: Scribner's, 1950), p. 69.

⁴H. Wheeler Robinson, *The Christian Doctrine of Man* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1913), p. 12.

ings. Its doctrinal statements, such as those summarized in its various symbols of faith, are vital expressions of its faith, formulating within historical contexts the meaning of those events which have brought it into being. Such expressions are guides for new historical eras. But to turn them around and make them the sole pattern of orthodoxy, and the verbalization of them the theory and practice of Christian education, is to ignore that they are only interpretations of experience and also to ignore the self. Christian education, if it deals with the emerging self, must help that self to formulate in words and concepts what is happening to it. But at levels deeper than mentality it must help the whole self to respond to the grace of God. As Whitehead has pointed out, "Mentality is an agent of simplification; and for this reason appearance is an incredibly simplified edition of reality."⁵ This is in no way belittling the rational. It is saying that theological formulations superimposed upon a child, youth, or adult, and parroted back, do not constitute Christian education as judged by its ultimate objective. Doctrine is vital to Christian nurture but the words of theology can so easily become an idol and the self miss the God of salvation. A free response of loving obedience to God is what Christian education desires from the self which has been encountered by the living God. Theological formulation is part of the self's glad offering to God.

Christian Education and the Bible

The Bible is a chief resource for Christian education. To know the Bible is surely a good in itself. But this good is a proximate goal and not the ultimate objective. As Dr. Richard Niebuhr says, "Without the Bible, as without the Church, Christians do not exist and cannot carry on their work; but it is one thing to recognize the indispensability of these means, another thing to make means into ends."⁶ In Dewey's understanding of the ends-means continuum, the prox-

mate goal becomes a means to the further goal, in this case the ultimate objective of God and neighbor.

The God who acts in every historical moment, whose love wills to fulfill us in our becoming, has acted in that peculiar strand of history, the Judaic-Christian tradition. In the Bible is the record of the mighty acts of God in Israel's history, in Jesus Christ, and in the Church of the New Testament. But these acts do not come uninterpreted. The faith of Israel and the Church is bound up with the acts of God so that the doings of God come interpreted to us through the Bible.

The Bible points to him who has acted and who continues to act for our redemption. The Bible is our primary witness to Christ and the Bible as witness dictates its use in Christian education. It brings us face-to-face with the God who came near in Jesus Christ. It does not call attention to itself but to him who is the living Word. It is a chief means by which God comes to the self with his gift of life and his claim upon life. So it is the Word of God for His Spirit makes the human words vibrant with the living Word, Jesus Christ.

Christian education, because it works so constantly with the Bible, can so easily transfer loyalty appropriate to God to the Book which is at best a means of grace. Or it can blunt the pointedness of the Bible by trying to make it more palatable to modern man. The Bible is embarrassment, a "scandal," to the contemporary mind and the temptation is to twist it to conform. Or Christian education can substitute less offensive, more contemporary curricula altogether, but the irony is that nothing is more contemporary than God's confronting man through the Bible and the offense itself becomes a ministry of healing. The predicament of man is his anxiety: cosmic, sinful, and neurotic; the God who comes to us in the Bible, comes to heal us with the giving of his own life. The Bible is a locus of confrontation and Christian education neglects or abuses this locus with peril to the emerging self.

One of the most needful inquiries I can

⁵Alfred North Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas* (New York: Macmillan, 1933), p. 273.

⁶Niebuhr, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

imagine is how to use the resources of the Bible to help each self in its efforts to be. Such an inquiry will need the work of all scholars in the theological community: systematic theologians, Biblical theologians, historians, Old and New Testament scholars, as well as Christian educators. It is my judgment that much Christian education at the local level is at least fifty years behind the findings of Biblical scholarship. For whatever reason this may be true, this performs a disservice to a self for which pre-scientific biblical understanding is an obstacle. It is hard to think that the God of truth is ever served by untruth or concealed truth. Christian education cannot operate without the Bible but it needs that tool to be as sharp and clear as possible. Then the self seeking for identity and integrity can have a better chance of meeting the God who can give identity and integrity.

Communities of Church and Home

We turn now to the setting in which the self is helped to know God and the neighbor. The setting is those communities of health, the church and the home. I say, "communities of health," for I am viewing both church and home as centers of healing. Of course, either too often is a center of pathology. But ideally, and in part really, they are the matrix of wholeness or redemption. Neither the Church nor the home is viewed as an end in itself. For the purposes of Christian education both are proximate goals becoming means to the ultimate goal.

The Church is the bearer of divine grace. It is that society whose defining characteristic is the redemptive grace of God in Jesus Christ responded to in faith by believers. The grace of God creates the Church and then uses the Church as the "mediating society of grace," through which intensively the love of God confronts each, eliciting the commitment of faith and the responsiveness of love. The Church asserts its own structure of grace primarily through worship and fellowship. At the heart of worship is the confrontation of each by the Word of God. John Calvin held that the Church existed wherever its marks were

truly present: the Word of God sincerely preached and heard and the sacraments rightly administered. The marks did not constitute the Church. They gave evidence that the Church was real; that is, that the grace of God was at work.

The Church is not only the bearer of grace by way of worship. It is also the instrument of God in and through its own intimate fellowship. Professor Albert Outler argues that human tragedy is compounded by inner alienation, that this "feeling of alienation is the clue to the human predicament." This sense of alienation is overcome by God who works redemptively in our midst. A primary locus of that working is the warm, intimate community of the Church. The soul of the Israelite was a healthy soul when it was participating positively in the covenant-community established by the covenant-God. Then it knew totality, wholeness. It was sick when separated from such community. As Dr. Lewis Sherrill said in his inaugural address at Union Seminary,

. . . the individual, whether infant, child, youth, or adult, is drawn away from loneliness, isolation, incompleteness, self-centeredness, frustration, and the like; and is drawn toward wholeness by the warm sense of belonging within a group of one's fellows who are seeking a better country, a city with foundations which cannot be shaken.⁷

Christian education, concerned with wholeness, is concerned with that group, or those groups, which can establish the quality of relationship which nurtures wholeness. A proximate goal of Christian education is to develop significant group life in which persons can experience ultimate worth. Significant group life is group life which is the bearer of the grace of God objectified through the "feeling-tone" of the group, a center of interaction in which each experiences the love of the group and is enabled to respond to the group. Significant group life centers about one will, God's, and seeks to incarnate his

⁷Lewis Joseph Sherrill, "Theological Foundations of Christian Education," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, Special Issue (Jan. 1951), p. 10.

will to love in personal-social life. Christian education is primarily concerned with that intimate web of relationships in which people are helped to respond to God and others as God wills that they do, and are thus helped to find wholeness. Each is defined by the group which is immanent in his life. *What* the group tone is, and *how* a person reacts to that group tone, is partly definitive of that person's existential being. Christian education needs to help provide a community of love which becomes a matrix of faith and love for each person.

Paul Vieth has said that *the curriculum of Christian education is the Church as fellowship*,^{8Cf.} This is true because in the Church as fellowship the meeting between God who acts and demands and the person who is called to respond in commitment is sharpened. Each learner is confronted with the essence and accidents of the faith of the community, that is, with God who has moved redemptively in Christ to create the community and renew its members, and with the temporal forms that recreativity has taken, forms such as creed, cultus, polity, etc.

It is through the love-community that the power of the gospel becomes effective. The Body of Christ as *koinonia*, work camps, cell fellowships, and Alcoholics Anonymous groups are illustrations of community which testify to an essential point in Christian education: that the recreating, redemptive power of the gospel is mediated through new men imaging God within a warm, spontaneous fellowship. We are made whole by participating in that body where, as Dr. Daniel Williams has said, "life is shared, sustained and renewed in a loving relationship to others."

What is said in reference to the Church as a particular quality of groupness can be said of the home. For the home is essentially a religious community. There must

be in the home, as Dr. Randolph Miller has said, "a climate in which grace flourishes." Not chiefly by word but by non-verbal communication does the child come to know that God is trustworthy and loving. If, as I am prepared to believe, a child cannot come to place his trust in God whom he has not seen until he can have some "basic trust" in a human being whom he has seen, the home is no less significant today than Bushnell said it was a century ago. If emotional disturbances and the pathology which so often results are to be traced to the formative years of childhood, the proximate goal of healthy homes is surely high on the Christian education agenda. And if the proximate goal is in turn a means of the divine-human confrontation, we may well say that the order of the day has arrived.

The Larger Community

A final word must be said about the larger community with which every self must interact. The cultural, social, political, economic environment is also the context in which God meets each person. In the here and now — on the job or in the political arena — where difficult ethical decisions must be made, God brings his will to bear. If God is at work in every concretion, is there any part of the environment in which Christian nurture is not involved? There is no doctrine, no science, no study, no event, no work strictly on its own account. Man in each experience is responsible to God in the concrete situation. Therefore, Christian education should be that specialized discipline to help each to become sensitive to God at every point of ethical decision. This calls for the interrelation of religion with all other pursuits, with science, art, politics, economics, et cetera, for religion is the "search for value basic for all things." This interrelation will take into consideration age differentia and individual limitations, characteristics, and propensities. Such interrelation will be the application of religious insights and sensitivity throughout the whole context of living. It will mean taking seriously that God is the core of integration,

^{8Cf} Paul Vieth, "The Content of the Curriculum," *Religious Education*, XLVII (Sept.-Oct., 1952), p. 311.

⁹Daniel Day Williams, *What Present-Day Theologians Are Thinking* (New York: Harper, 1952), p. 129.

the unifying center of all experience, and that a harmonious person is one whose commitment to the Sovereign Good reigns throughout all his relationships. This will require a marriage of thought and action. Christian education is charged with responsibility to help each self develop Christian ethical norms and before God to possess

the freedom in which to implement the norms in the daily life.

Christian education is a means to help each within historical process to be more open to the qualitative aspects of experience, more sensitive to the leading of God, more fully committed to do the will of God through Jesus Christ.

Financial Support

The Religious Education Association and its journal, like every other American institution, has been affected by economic changes and the reduced value of the dollar over the past ten years. There has been no increase in national dues of R. E. A. members since 1950. The Board of Directors, at its meeting on May 12, 1958, decided that it was imperative to increase the minimum professional dues from \$5.00 to \$7.50, in order to meet the increased cost of all services and to maintain the expanding work of the Association. All members and subscribers have been notified by mail that this increase will take effect September 1, 1958. Members and subscribers who wish to renew before that date may do so at the old rate of \$5.00.

It has been possible to carry on and expand the work of the Association during the past eight years only because a large number of its professional members regularly and voluntarily paid annual dues of \$10.00 to \$25.00, as contributing or supporting members. Also many friends of the Association have annually sent it \$50.00 to \$100.00, or more, as "sustaining" and "donor" members. It is hoped that all these members will continue their larger support beyond the minimum dues. Even with the minimum dues increased to \$7.50, the Association needs the help of these more generous, and sometimes sacrificial, supporters if the program of the Association is to be maintained at its present level and if ever new opportunities for service are to be met.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies. By FRANK M. CROSS, JR. New York: Doubleday & Co. 196 pages. \$4.50.

A flood of books on Qumran has poured into libraries and bookstores, few by competent authors. Only rarely has a work appeared from the group of the most qualified Qumran scholars, those who form the international research team at Jerusalem, deciphering and editing the thousands of fragments gathered there. A cloud of mystery hovers about these men as they work with texts still unknown, drinking from the foundation of Qumran knowledge. Even the scholar outside must wait anxiously for the secrets of the scrollery at Qumran to be unveiled.

J. M. Allegro was the first member of the research staff to write a comprehensive book on the Dead Sea Scrolls (1956). But before it appeared, some of his views were sharply contested by former colleagues in Jerusalem. J. T. Milik's brilliant report on ten years of discoveries in the Judean desert (1957) deserves much more attention, though it is rather short. Now F. M. Cross, Jr., who was the American representative at Jerusalem for a long time, and well-known for a series of Qumran articles, has contributed a substantial analysis. His book contains the Haskell Lectures for 1956-57 which he delivered to the Graduate School of Theology at Oberlin College. It offers the advantages of both books by his predecessors. In the first chapter he gives the story of the discoveries and of the content of the caves, in the refreshing way of J. M. Allegro. Then in the following chapters he reconstructs the life and history of the sect, in the sober and scholarly manner of J. T. Milik. His survey of the texts includes interesting news of some unpublished texts, especially of scrolls from Cave XI, which the author examined in 1956. (Cf. p. 25)

Professor Cross leads the reader into the workshop at Jerusalem and describes with humor the complex task of cleaning and sorting the fragments, the competitive efforts of the scholars to solve the riddle of a cryptic script, and their theological sessions in the garden cafés at night. Using the method of J. T. Milik, he sets forth the life and history of the sect in chapters II and III. He combines all the data given by the scrolls with the reports of ancient historians like Philo, Pliny, and Josephus, and with the results of archaeological and paleographical research. He gives paleography an important place since it is "perhaps the most precise and objective means of determining the age of a manuscript." (p. 87) The degree to which manuscripts can be precisely dated in this way enables the author to sweep away a lot of theories on the origin of the sect, and to construct the framework of his view on solid ground.

Like J. T. Milik, F. M. Cross definitely identifies the sect of Qumran with the Essenes. It seems to me that the scholars around Father de Vaux and J. T. Milik have succeeded in establishing a theory of Essene history which will soon prevail

and make it difficult for any scholar to stand against it. However Cross deviates from Milik's view in some important details. While the founder of the sect, the 'Righteous Teacher,' "remains a shadowy figure," (p. 116) the 'Wicked Priest' is not Jonathan (160-142 B.C.) but his brother Simon who followed him (142-134). Cross does not think that the community "in the Land of Damascus" ever lived in the region of Hauran, because he takes 'Damascus' to be only the prophetic name for Qumran. (Cf. pp. 59 f.) He does not restrict the Zealot character of the sect to the last phase of Essenerism, but says it belongs essentially to its ever-vivid apocalypticism.

The fourth chapter is probably the most revealing of the whole book. The author shows the great importance of the nearly hundred Biblical scrolls, whose fragments were found in Cave IV, for the textual history of the Old Testament. These scrolls represent three traditions of text: a proto-Masoretic form, a text which corresponds to the one lying behind the LXX, and a version close to the Samaritan Pentateuch.

The last chapter deals with the parallels between the scrolls of Qumran and the writings of the New Testament. The main attitude which the Essenes and the early Christians had in common was their apocalyptic world-view, and their sense of living in eschatological time. But the author also treats the resemblance between the sect's teaching on the two spirits and the dualism in the writings of John, then common features in the scheme of Messianic expectation, in the structure of the communities, and in their holy rites. He points out in a postscript the essential difference between Essenerism and Christianity: For Christians the Messiah, for whom the Qumran community was waiting had already come. Christian faith is the fulfillment of Essene hope.

Excellent photographs and maps, as well as a large number of comprehensive notes, illustrate and support the author's reports and conclusions, and combine to make this book very valuable for both layman and scholar. — Otto Betz, Institutum Judaicum, University of Tuebingen, Germany.

• • •

The Nature of the Unity We Seek: Official Report of the North American Conference on Faith and Order, September 3-10, 1957, Oberlin, Ohio. Ed. by PAUL S. MINEAR. Bethany Press, St. Louis, 1958. Pages 304. \$4.00.

This is a report of one of the most important and unique ecumenical conferences ever held. Just how unique, and how related to previous conferences, the reader may learn from the editor's introductory chapter on "The Conference in Context," and from J. Robert Nelson's chapter (pp. 44-51) on "The Oberlin Conference in Ecumenical Perspective." Briefly, it was the first large-scale attempt (preceded by two small-scale conferences in New Zealand and India) to "bring the discussion of Christian unity down from the awe-

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGION

by WALTER HOUSTON CLARK, *Professor of Psychology and Dean of the Hartford School of Religious Education, Hartford Seminary Foundation*

In this new work, Dr. Clark defines and describes the field of the psychology of religion and presents the elements for a consistent theory of the place of religion in personality. Written in the general tradition of William James, J. B. Pratt, P. E. Johnson, and Gordon Allport, the book utilizes empirical findings and case studies, as well as contemporary theories of psychology. Included are discussions of religious growth, the psychological dynamics involved in religious development, and the relation of religion to abnormal psychology and psychotherapy.

1958

485 pages

\$5.95

SELECTED READINGS IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION

Edited by JOE PARK, *Northwestern University*

Covering a wide range of thought, this collection includes substantial portions of some of the best-known works of representative authors, organized according to their philosophical position. Included are Dewey's *Democracy and Education* (40 pages), Whitehead's *Aims of Education* (two chapters), Breed's *Education and the New Realism* (50 pages) and selections from Herman Harrell Horne, Theodore Meyer Greene, Israel S. Chipkin, Pope Pius XI and others. Biographical material is included.

1958

440 pages

\$5.00

RELIGION, SOCIETY AND THE INDIVIDUAL

by J. MILTON YINGER, *Oberlin College*

This is a systematic analysis of the sociology of religion in terms of contemporary theories of sociology, anthropology, and psychology.

1957

655 pages

\$6.75

RELIGION IN MODERN LIFE

by GEORGE G. HACKMAN, CHARLES W. KEGLEY, and VILJO K. NIKANDER, *Wagner College*

This work examines the nature and function of religion and of religious knowledge in the modern western world from the Christian viewpoint.

1957

480 pages

\$4.25

The Macmillan Company

60 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 11, N. Y.

some level of world-wide representation to regional, national and local soil" (p. 50).

Besides the reports of the twelve Sections and three Divisions, and the general Message to the Churches, this volume contains ten of the principal public addresses, a running account of the schedule and proceedings, a statement by the Eastern Orthodox delegates, a list of personnel both of the conference and of the sixteen study groups that prepared for it, plus an appendix on the chief North American social force conditioning Christian unity: *mobility of population*.

Some of the addresses, such as those by Robert Calhoun and Joseph Sittler, and all of the sectional reports in the first Division, deal with the faith and worship of the churches comparatively, in a manner now familiar from previous Faith and Order conferences since the beginning of the movement at Lausanne in 1927, but with significant advances toward wider agreement. (Calhoun's address won approval from widely different theological angles.) More distinctive of this conference were the addresses by A. L. Outler on "Our Common History" and Walter Mueler on "Institutionalism," and the reports of Divisions II and III on "Organizational Structures" and "Cultural Pressures."

Here it was that the traditional theological approach of Faith and Order met the American practical concern for social process — to their mutual advantage. It seems probable that the historic achievements of the Oberlin conference were (1) to make North America more interested in Faith and Order studies of the traditional sort, and (2) to give new concreteness and applicability to these studies by intimately relating the sociological and theological approaches. Thereby, the Ecumenical Movement was brought down out of the stratosphere, much closer to the "grass roots" of American church life than ever before. — *Walter M. Horton*, Professor of Systematic Theology, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

* * *

The American Teenager. By H. H. REMMERS AND D. H. RADLER. Indianapolis-New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1957. 267 pages. \$3.75.

This book is a report to the public of the findings of a fifteen year Opinion Poll Study of the American Teenager conducted by Dr. Remmers under the auspices of Purdue University and the Purdue Opinion Panel.

To understand fully the contents of this book, the significance of the Study, and the style in which it is written, some knowledge of the backgrounds of the writer and the researcher is important. Dr. Remmers is director of Purdue University's Division of Educational Reference and originator of the Purdue Opinion Panel. Mr. Radler writes for newspapers and magazines about research in all fields as a free lance writer. He is also a member of the Purdue University staff and edits University publications such as the monthly bulletin of the Purdue Research Foundation.

The long and tedious attitudinal data collected from a stratified sampling of American teenagers done by Dr. Remmers and staff merits high praise. The Study was conducted by polling 2500 American high school teenagers, grades 9 through 12,

through use of 49 individual polls. In addition to the polls, Dr. Remmers collected anonymous letters from 2000 high school students concerning their problems.

The rationale for this Study was not only fact-finding regarding the attitudes of the American teenager but also to use the findings as a means of predicting the public opinion of the future — as the teenager thinks now, so will he think as an adult.

From the chapter headings and the tables summarizing relevant findings of the polls appended to Chapters 3 through 9, the reviewer is impressed by the varied and numerous areas covered by the Study: physical, sexual, social problems; relationship with parents, school life; the teenager's future; his views on religion, ethics, and science.

An effort is made by the writer to describe in the earlier chapters the world which the teenager inherited and to give a general survey of the responses from the polls as a warning forecast for the future. Later chapters attempt to set down rather vaguely how parents, teachers, and other adults can help the teenager. The final chapter presents the writers' views on delinquency versus non-delinquency. Suggested readings and bibliographies complete the book.

To translate the data collected into understandable terms was a tremendously challenging assignment. It is in the selectivity of the data for translation and inference that the book loses stature and tends to become sensational, either to shock the reader or to emphasize particular findings in a flamboyant, dramatic appeal to the preconceived interest of a mass audience, the public.

The criticism of the reviewer is focused on the style in which the book is written, the questionable inferences and implications made of certain percentages of this statistical data. In addition, there appears to be a certain lack of knowledge and understanding of the psycho-social stage of development of the teenager. In this area, the authors tend toward elementary simplicity, emphasizing problems without an equal emphasis on the needs of the teenager during this developmental period.

The data collected and summarized in the appended tables is valuable for all persons interested in and working with teenagers. The book, however, should be read with sensitivity and critical objectivity. — *Mrs. Florence Clemenger*, Lecturer and Consultant, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley.

* * *

A Social and Religious History of the Jews: High Middle Ages, 500-1200. By SALO W. BARON. Second Edition. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957. 3 volumes. 1108 pages. \$15.

Professor Baron has delved into a formidable array of source materials in revising and expanding these middle volumes of his projected eight-volume study of the turbulent Jewish history from "Ancient Times" through the "High Middle Ages." In volume three ("Heirs of Rome and Persia") he traces the effects of Islam's rise and spread upon Jews in Arab countries. He points out that despite the legal restrictions and forced conversions resulting from Mohammed's failure to gain acceptance as the awaited Jewish redeemer there did not develop the intense hatred between Muslim and

Jew that for centuries blighted Christian-Jewish relations; in fact, Eastern Jewry so benefited from early Muslim achievements that by the end of the twelfth century an "affluent and intellectually alert" Jewish population of about two million was scattered throughout the Caliphate.

Islam Jewry's prosperity contrasted sharply with the peripheral Jewish settlements of Khazaria, India, China, and Western Christendom. Evidence of their communal origins and growth during a millennium of Roman and Byzantine hostility is scarce — particularly in reference to the fabulous Jewish kingdom of Khazaria, but there does emerge a courageous minority's tenacious perseverance, plus the ironic fact that Jewish refugees from Byzantine-Christian persecution prepared Russia, Hungary, and Rumania for the Christian mission by teaching the pagan Slavs and Bulgars their own "historical and ethical monotheism," and "their biblical tradition" (221). Baron devotes volume four ("Meeting of East and West") to the division of Jewish culture into its Sephardic and Ashkenazic branches during the crucial half-millennium from the eighth to the twelfth century. Arabic-speaking Jews, arriving in Christian Spain, Italy, France, and Germany from the disintegrating Muslim and Byzantine empires, found their knowledge of Greek and Muslim customs, philosophy, and science enabled some among them to climb to high place even at the most antagonistic Western courts. The Western kings, however, often reduced Jewish officials to "economic serfdom" by employing them as "royal usurers" and expropriating the bulk of their profits, leaving them little more than the relentless enmity of the aristocracy, churchmen, and burghers. Despite countless obstacles, however, Jews soon became the major commercial mediators between East and West and reflected their general prosperity in a twelfth-century Renaissance of Spanish-Jewish letters. But in 1096 Western Jewry's serenity was shattered by the first Crusaders, whose bloody pogroms established a pattern for future centuries. The Jews suffered again and again, yet persisted and even prospered. As Spain's Yehudah Halevi pointed out, persecution was not a new Jewish experience and to suffer, after all, was perhaps but "an essential part of Jewish and human destiny" (147).

Both Muslim and Christian, finding legal and physical means inadequate, sought also theological condemnation of Jews. And in volume five ("Religious Controls and Dissension") Baron relates the various disputes waged by these three major religions. The proud, conquering Muslims, viewing themselves as descendants of the outcast Hagar and Ishmael and gloating over Abraham's "poor and lowly" legitimate offspring, were irked by Jewish insistence that at the proper time a prophet-messiah would lead them to victory over all foes. Ironically enough, this messianic dream not only contributed largely to the development of the Christ idea, but blended with Arabian folktales to influence Mohammed and his early successors. Yet despite the bitter religious recriminations accruing to this despised minority, their segregation during the Middle Ages was almost completely voluntary. There were some notable exceptions, but the bulk of Medieval Jewry preferred, and Rabbinic law encouraged, communal isolation as a means of strengthening religious, social, and educational



The Story of the Christian Church

By **WINTHROP S. HUDSON**

Professor of the
History of Christianity
Colgate-Rochester Divinity School

One of the best short introductions available to the unfolding drama of the Church through the ages. **THE STORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH** is a source book, written in laymen's language, which provides stimulating material for many types of study and discussion groups.

FEATURES:

- Compact chapters with the explanatory historical material brought together near the beginning of each chapter.
- 24 illustrations from old prints and woodcuts.
- Questions to Think About.
- Suggestions for Further Reading.

\$2.25

Pointing the Way

By **MARTIN BUBER**

"Since Martin Buber is undoubtedly one of the genuine wise men of our generation, this collection of his essays will be welcome. The essays cover a period from 1910 to the present." — REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *N. Y. Times Book Review*. \$5.00

At your bookseller



HARPER & BROTHERS

NEW YORK 16

unity. Enforced segregation and charges of "exclusiveness" appeared much later.

Nor was all serene within the Jewish communities. Not only did David's exilic descendants compete bitterly with the heads of the two major Academies for communal leadership, but various sectarian movements — such as the Samaritan and Karaite — evolved through the centuries from constant additions to the messianic beliefs. Yet Baron's thesis that these sects were "quite ephemeral" and advocates primarily of complete union into "one nation, the Chosen People" (285), does not prevent him from allocating eighty pages to the Karaites alone. This argument — among others — is stated early and often. Thus if Baron's bibliographical ability to ferret out and record Arabic and Hebraic names and events is extremely impressive, his verbosity, discursiveness, and lack of narrative power weaken the historical drama. Occasional grammatical errors and syntactical ambiguities detract little, but history bereft of drama becomes mere chronicling.

These three heavily documented volumes contribute undeniably to academic scholarship, but their failure to excite the reader's imagination by a compelling sense of memorable people doing memorable things will cause those who seek "sweetness" as well as "light" in historical writings to read elsewhere. — *Bern Siegel*, Chairman, Department of English, California State Polytechnic College, Pomona, California.

* * *

... TWO NEW BOOKS GREAT PHRASES OF THE CHRISTIAN LANGUAGE

TRUMAN B. DOUGLASS *et al*

Phrases familiar, but not always meaningful, to Christians are analyzed by seven outstanding church leaders. \$2.00
A United Church Press book.

OLD TESTAMENT PORTRAITS

KENDRICK STRONG

A skilled story teller relates incidents in the lives of fourteen biblical figures that are sure to revive an interest in the Old Testament. Illustrated by Harold Minton. \$3.50

At bookstores

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION PRESS
1505 RACE STREET
PHILADELPHIA 2, PA.

The God Within: How to Achieve the Maximum of Health and Happiness. By CRISTINA MIDDLETON VALENTINE. New York: Exposition Press, 1957. 222 pages. \$3.50.

After reading the book twice I am in full agreement with Seymour Weiss, director of Promotion and Publicity for Exposition Press who wrote as follows about Mrs. Valentine and her book:

"Only one of the extraordinary things about attractive and talented Cristina Midence Valentine is that she speaks two languages and understands five — although she has never heard one. She has been totally deaf since infancy.

"This disability has been an incentive rather than a drawback, and in her forty years (by the calendar but not the naked eye) she has achieved recognition in a variety of fields. The latest is an author in the United States: her book, *The God Within*.

"This book, subtitled "How to Achieve the Maximum of Health and Happiness" had its genesis in the sufferings and hardships she endured; its gestation during her studies of psychology, sociology and the world's major religions, and its fruition after her perfection of a constructive and workable philosophy of life. A testament of faith and inspiration, the book is, moreover, a practical guide for better living in today's chaotic world."

In her chapter on "We Need a World Fund of Wisdom" the author makes a significant suggestion as the following paragraph (page 215) indicates:

"What we need to bring order out of the above chaos, and thus reduce the unnecessary suffering born of the latter, is a world fund of wisdom, a clearinghouse for scientists with and without title all over the world in all languages, to which they can submit their findings to be correlated with the findings of other scientists in the same and complimentary fields.

"Pansynecrism," Mrs. Valentine asserts (page 216) "is the name coined for this exact science of reconciling conflicting and fully proven findings, filling in gaps, and carrying on or ordering further investigation with the foregoing purpose, always with a global viewpoint. It is a combination of the word "pan" (all) and "syncretism" (science of the reconciliation of contradictory teachings). The scientists who devote themselves to this task are "pansynecrists."

The book is a "must" for pastors and others who have the responsibility of counselling and trying to help other people with their personal problems. Suggestions on what a homosexual and the female counterpart — Lesbian — may do to overcome their "abnormal" (though probably not "unnatural") behavior are given on pages 104 and 179. In this same connection, her chapter on "What to Do About Harmful Deviations," can prove very helpful to many people.

Parents, especially those with infants and young children, could read the book with profit, particularly if they would get a real understanding of the full impact of an observation on "Modern theories of rearing children . . ." on page 122.

I do not hesitate to recommend this book as good reading for those interested in theology and religion, especially to theological students. The

writer proves to be a keen student of theology as is shown in her discussion of such subjects used as chapter headings as, Life: Chance or Divine Plan? What is God? What is Evil? The Golden Rule Clarified. What is Perfection? Does Hell Exist? What is the True Religion? — *Clarence T. R. Nelson*, Superintendent of the Columbus District of the Lexington Conference of The Methodist Church, Columbus, Ohio.

* * *

American Protestantism and Social Issues 1919-1939. By ROBERT MOATS MILLER. Chapel Hill, 1958. 385 pp. \$6.00.

When I am teaching a class, I am unhappy until I get well enough acquainted with my students to invite them into the office and find out what their interests are.

As I read Mr. Miller's book, I came to wonder just what it was that motivated him to write it. Scholars, of course, are supposed to be objective — and Mr. Miller is. Nevertheless, I could not help feeling that whatever it was that prompted him to write this book was something sub-conscious and some how mysterious. Perhaps our paths will meet one day, thus permitting me to straighten out in my mind those matters which only the author could throw light on.

A book such as Mr. Miller's is never fails to overwhelm me. The amount of work required is tremendous. Obviously he read all of his sources and I would venture the observation that he arrived to that point from which he could project reaction. I felt good as I perused it. For, his reflections supported the philosophy which has been my guide through all the years in the labor movement and participation in liberal causes. Organized Protestantism is a good and effective means to Christian action. In every human area, with the exception of race relations, the Protestant church and its laymen have "stood out." When I laid down Mr. Miller's book, I was somehow less apologetic than I sometimes am for organized Protestantism. Perhaps Einstein knew of whence he spoke when he placed the church in the first place on a list of possible effective means of challenging Hitlerism.

All of the above, however, is not to suggest that there were not those areas of omission. And, these should be mentioned. For instance, I feel that the book ought to have included a chapter on mavericks; i.e., those labor movement people who had left the church but were still its children in that the church had formulated their basic values and basic perspectives. As a member of one of the more withdrawing sects, the Brethren church, and as a long-time worker in the Quaker vineyard, I thought that the influence of these deeply fundamentalistic churches was minimized. For, I was tremendously impressed, while in the labor movement, by the Holiness, Pentecostal and other related sects. Of course, no minutes were kept and no papers were written so such a chapter would involve unique difficulties. Even so, perhaps in a later book Mr. Miller will undertake this important study. I do not wish to end on a negative note and this presents a perfect opportunity to convey, in conclusion, my appreciation of his argument that vitality is a component part of free churches. Further, I was impressed by his observation that while the churches swing with the pendulum of the times, there were always those groups and in-

CHURCH AND CULTURE

IN THE

MIDDLE AGES

Schnurer-Udreiner

The spiritual, cultural, and intellectual mission of Christianity in the years from 350 to 814 is magnificently set forth in this unique volume. Bibliography. \$7.50

Bookstores or Dept. 4-2624

ST. ANTHONY GUILD PRESS

Paterson, N. J.

dividuals who kept their vision and were true to their conviction. As a long time servant in the Federal and now National Council of Churches, I must say that its record recommends it well. For me, the story of how Bishop McConnell and the Council investigated the steel industry was the high point of the book.

I can say no more than that to read it was a source of sincere enjoyment and profound enlightenment. Thus, I recommend it heartily. — *Kermit R. Eby, Sr.*, Professor of the Social Sciences, University of Chicago.

* * *

BOOK NOTES

The Acts of the Apostles by C. S. C. WILLIAMS and *The Epistle to the Romans* by C. K. BARRETT. New York: Harper and Bros., 1958. \$4.00 per volume.

These are the first published volumes of a promising series of New Testament commentaries to be written by British and American scholars which will bring a valuable new resource to theological and other students of the New Testament.

The commentary on the Acts is written by C. S. C. Williams, a Fellow of Merton College, Oxford. Mr. Williams gives a succinct and admirable summary of all the recent scholarly work done on the

Acts, sets forth with great clarity the problems which the book presents and the possible solutions of them. For the most part he leaves the reader to make his own conclusions. Mr. Williams, using his own literal translation, as the basis of his patient exegesis, brings the reader a fresh and stimulating approach to the story of the beginnings of the early church.

In his commentary on Romans, Mr. Barrett, a Senior Lecturer in Theology in the University of Durham, also uses his own translation of the letter to make more clear what he believes Paul meant. Though his translation is not as sparkling as that of J. B. Phillips, it does serve to illuminate the more difficult passages in Paul's writing.

Mr. Barrett's understanding of Paul is clear, sane, and solid. He has a sound appreciation of the importance of Romans for Christian thought and of its relevance for these times, and an unusual ability to write readable prose. The result is a commentary which will be as useful for the ordinary reader of the New Testament as for the one possessed of the scholar's tools. — *Thomas Wesley Graham*, Dean Emeritus, Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Old Greenwich, Conn.



Christian Theology: an Ecumenical Approach (revised edition). By WALTER MARSHALL HORTON. Harper, 1958. 343 pp. \$4.00.

The post-war era has witnessed the growth of a deep concern for Christian unity among American Protestants. Partial implementation in the field of Church amalgamation occasionally hits the headlines, whereas the convergence of theological thought toward common centers of interest is not so well in view. The singular merit of Dr. Horton is to sketch the present-day theological consensus and divergences among the major denominations and theologians. The picture is wide enough to include accounts of Roman Catholic thought. This is wise, as Roman Catholic theologians, although not officially participant, have shown great and increasing interest, in the modern ecumenical movement.

The revised edition carries an appendix on non-Christian religions, which is designed to help missionaries in their task. The author has also made a number of additions and corrections to his original text.

Being written for Protestants, this ecumenical approach to theology naturally stresses points that have been at the fore of Protestant thinking. As such it is indispensable to theological students. It also provides Catholics who desire to be better acquainted with the present state of Protestant theology with the most readable account that can now be found. It will be all the more useful to them as Professor Horton, by his fair and well-informed presentation of the Catholic position, makes comparison and "correction" easy. — *George H. Taward*, Assumption College, Worcester, Massachusetts.



Teens to 21. By ALBERTA Z. BROWN. St. Louis: Bethany Press, 1957. 95 pages. \$1.75.

The author knows older teen-agers. Her challenging chats on decisions, opportunities, citizen-

ship, courtship, overcoming obstacles, cooperation, individuality, commitment speak in the parlance of today's youth.

Christian insight into everyday problems of living set forth clearly the type of choices which youth need to make continually. Christian values are basic in all the conversations with "teens to twenty-one."

The interesting style will intrigue older youth as well as attract their counsellors and parents. The illustrations by Bill Jackson convey the problems and are delightfully entertaining. — *Dorothy K. Wolcott*, Professor of Christian Education and Elementary Education, Findlay College, Findlay, Ohio.



Christian Worship: Its History and Meaning. By HORTON DAVIES. New York-Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1957. 128 pages. \$2.00.

In this short volume the author, professor of religion at Princeton University, presents a simple and introductory study of Christian liturgics. The first section deals with the Jewish antecedents of Christian worship and then, after a chapter on the practices of the apostolic church, examines both sympathetically and critically the chief liturgical traditions of the present time. The second section analyzes the elements which enter into Christian worship — prayer and praise and the proclamation of the Word of God through scripture, sermon and sacrament. In the last section the importance of corporate worship and the relationship of worship to life are considered. The book fulfills well its limited purpose and should awaken in the reader a desire to study more fully this important subject. — *W. C. Seitz*, Bexley Hall, Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio.



Unitarian Christianity and Other Essays. By WILLIAM ELLERY CHANNING. New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1958. 121 pages. 80 cents.

This is an excellent collection of five essays to show a full view of the religious thinking of William Ellery Channing. "Unitarian Christianity" has long been accepted as the rationale for the beginning of the Unitarian movement. In this sermon Channing shows his high regard for reason. To balance this, the essay "The Evidences of Revealed Religion" was chosen to show his belief in the miraculous nature of Christianity. Two of the remaining essays show his thought on the foundations of duty and social action.

Unitarians who read this book may be surprised to see how far they have moved from their theological beginning. The non-Unitarian may be surprised to see the Father of Unitarianism expressing their own liberal Protestant position. Nevertheless, both will read of a man who well illustrates the great American heritage of freedom of religious belief. It is this principle of freedom plus his emphasis on the use of reason when creating one's theology that still live on in the Unitarian movement. — *Ralph Stulzman*, All Soul's Church, Unitarian, Washington, D. C.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

JUDAH PILCH, Chairman, Executive Director, American Association of Jewish Education, New York City.

DAVID BARRY, New York City Mission Society, New York City.

GLENN GARBUTT, Management Consultant, New York City.

DAVID R. HUNTER, Director, Department of Education, National Council of Protestant Episcopal Church, Greenwich, Conn.

F. ERNEST JOHNSON, National Council of Churches, New York City.

THOMAS J. QUIGLEY, Pastor, St. Canice Catholic Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.

COMMITTEE ON HIGHER EDUCATION

JOHN M. KRUMM, Chairman, Chaplain, Columbia University, New York City.

JERALD C. BRAUER, Dean, The Federated Theological Faculty, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

WALTER HOUSTON CLARK, Dean, School Religious Education, Hartford, Connecticut.

CHARLES DONAHUE, Associate Professor of English, Fordham University, New York City.

MAURICE FRIEDMAN, Professor of Philosophy, Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, N. Y.

JEROME G. KERWIN, Chairman, Chicago Institute of Social and Religious Studies and Professor of Political Science, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

ROLAND G. SIMONITSCHI, Professor of Religion, University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Indiana.

WALTER WAGONER, Exec. Secretary, Rockefeller Brothers Fund for Theological Fellowships, Princeton, N. J.

COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH

WALTER HOUSTON CLARK, Chairman, Dean, School Religious Education, Hartford, Connecticut.

DENTON R. COKER, Professor of Christian Education, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, North Carolina.

J. FRANKLIN EWING, S.J., Professor of Anthropology and Coordinator of Research, Fordham University, New York, N. Y.

GORDON E. JACKSON, Professor of Philosophy and Religious Education, Pittsburgh-Xenia Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Penn.

ERNEST M. LIGON, Director, Character Research Project, Union College, Schenectady, N. Y.

RICHARD V. McCANN, Professor of Christian Sociology, Andover-Newton Theological School, Newton Centre, Mass.

SISTER MARY JANET MILLER, S.C., Commission on American Citizenship, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

G. PAUL MUSSelman, Executive Secretary, Division of Urban Industrial Church Work, National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church, New York City.

SYLVAN SCHWARTZMAN, Professor of Religious Education, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio.

MARSHALL SKLARE, Director, Division of Scientific Research, American Jewish Committee, New York, N. Y.

HELEN SPAULDING, Director of Christian Education Research, National Council of Churches, New York City.

FRANCIS W. VOELCKER, Executive Secretary of the General Unit of Evaluation, Department of Christian Education, National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Greenwich, Conn.

LAURIS B. WHITMAN, Executive Director of the Bureau of Research and Survey, National Council of Churches, New York City.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

OFFICERS

PRESIDENT — Jerome Kerwin, Professor of Political Science, University of Chicago; also formerly Chairman, Walgreen Foundation, and Chairman of the Chicago Institute of Social and Religious Studies.

CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS — Randolph C. Miller, Professor of Religious Education, Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.

CHAIRMAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE — Judah Pilch, Executive Director, American Association for Jewish Education, N. Y. C.

THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

J. W. Ashton—Vice-President, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.
W. W. Brickman—Professor, School of Education, New York University, New York City, N. Y.
Dorothy Calkins—Executive Secretary, Evanston Council of Churches.
Wm. V. E. Casey, S.J.—Dean, School of Arts and Sciences, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Mass.
Elias Charry—Rabbi, Germantown Jewish Center, Philadelphia, Pa.
Stewart G. Cole—Education Director, National Conference of Christians and Jews, Los Angeles, Cal.
Ira Eisenstein—Rabbi, Congregation Anshe Emet, Chicago, Ill.
Sister Mary Emil—Staff of the National Catholic Education Association, Washington, D. C.
Robert E. Fitch—Dean, Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Calif.
Sandford Fleming—President, Berkeley Baptist Divinity School, Berkeley, Cal.
Solomon B. Freehof—Rabbi Rodef Shalom Temple, Pittsburgh, Pa.
Casimir Gabriel—Dean, Manhattan College, New York City.
Emanuel Gamor—Director of Education, Commission on Jewish Education, Union of American Hebrew Congregations.
Richard Gilman—Director, National Council on Religion and Higher Education, New Haven, Conn.
Albert I. Gordon—Rabbi, Temple Emanuel, Newton Center, Mass.
Simon Greenberg—Vice Chancellor, Jewish Theological Seminary, New York City, N. Y.
Bertram Gulserich—Field Director, National Center, Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, Washington, D. C.
Donald R. Heiges—Executive Secretary, Division of College and University Work, National Lutheran Council, New York City.
Ralph Heim—Professor of English Bible and Religious Education, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.
Richard Hertz—Rabbi, Temple Beth El, Detroit, Mich.
David R. Hunter—Director, Dept. of Education, National Council of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Greenwich, Conn.
Louis Katzoff—Registrar, College of Jewish Studies, Chicago, Ill.

(The Officers and Standing Committee Chairmen are also Members of Board of Directors)

Registered Agent: Ernest J. Chave, 5731 Harper Ave., Chicago 37, Illinois.

VICE PRESIDENT — F. Ernest Johnson, Emeritus Professor of Teachers College, Columbia; Research Consultant for the National Council of Churches.

VICE PRESIDENT — Thurston Davis, S.J., Editor of *AMERICA*, N. Y. C.

VICE PRESIDENT — Joseph Lockstein, Professor of Sociology, Yeshiva University, New York City.

RECORDING SECRETARY — Carl Ellis Nelson, Professor of Religious Education, Union Theological Seminary, N. Y. C.

TREASURER — Glenn Garbutt, Management Consultant, New York City.

Charles D. Kean—Rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C.
Hugh Lamarr—Executive Secretary, Dept. of Christian Education, Church Federation of Greater Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Donald Leonard—Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., Philadelphia, Pa.
Frank Lindhorst—College of the Pacific, Stockton, California.

Lawrence C. Little—University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

David W. Louise—The Law School, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
Oliver Martin—Professor of Philosophy, University of Rhode Island, Providence, Rhode Island.

James C. McLeod—Dean of Students, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

Sister Mary Janet Miller—Commission on American Citizenship, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

William Walden Pell II—Recently retired headmaster of St. Andrew's School, now at Elkton, Md.

Thomas C. Pollock—Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, New York University, New York City, N. Y.

A. H. Priest—General Secretary, General Board of Religious Education, The Anglican Church of Canada, Toronto, Ontario.

Thomas J. Quigley—Pastor, St. Canice Church, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Alwyn C. Roberts—General Director, Commission on General Christian Education, National Council of Churches, New York City, N. Y.

Fred Rehagle—Rohrer, Hibler & Rehagle, Chicago, Illinois.

Louis L. Ruffman—Assistant Director, Jewish Education Committee, New York City.

A. L. Sebaly—Coordinator Teacher Education and Religion Project of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

George N. Shuster—President, Hunter College, New York City.

Edward Sproul—Executive Secretary for Programs and Research, National Council of the Y.M.C.A., New York City.

John P. Wodarski—Director, Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, Archdiocese of Hartford, Hartford, Conn.

J. Wendell Yeo—Vice President, Boston University, Boston, Mass.